1620 hrs. (Mr. Speaker *in the Chair*)

Title: Further discussion regarding recent summit level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra raised by Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav on 24th July, 2001.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I recall the observation that you made when this matter was taken up on the 25th of July that it was a very important matter, it dealt with national issues and so we ought to deal with the matter in a proper manner. We agree respectfully with your observation that this matter is of utmost importance. After a long time we had an occasion of having a summit of this importance. It is a disappointment to all that it had ended in a failure, in a sense. I had said earlier that we did not consider it a total failure. We hope that in future the talks will continue. There is no substitute to dialogue, especially in the light of what we have been experiencing over the years. So, I said earlier also that Simla Agreement and the Lahore Declaration have to be the foundation of this talk. I do not wish to go back upon what I had said briefly on the last occasion when my speech had been, due to a very unfortunate and tragic event, interrupted.

Sir, I must once again express my unhappiness over the statement which the hon. Prime Minister had made. He had not said anything which we did not know from the papers. It was all known. Not a single thing has been said that was not known to us. There was a tremendous goodwill for the success of this talk. All political parties supported the Government in this endeavour. But, at the end of the day, I am sorry to say, it appeared that we were totally out of control of the situation. The Government behaved in a manner which clearly expressed their amateurish ineptitude. I cannot think of any such important matter being dealt with so casually and so unprofessionally. Although we should have been the major player, it appeared that we had ceased to be in the driver's seat. We were looking like minor actors in a drama where the junior partner became the major actor and played the well-rehearsed role. It was most pathetic to see our discomfiture.

The Prime Minister in a statement had said, 'we will engage in quiet and serious diplomacy'. 'Quiet and serious' does not mean 'thoughtless unpreparedness'.

Normally, Summits are held after a good deal of preparations, discussions, and long-drawn homework on both sides about the areas of discussion, subjects of discussion and about the possible outcome. But strangely, in this case, it appears that the Summit was the starting point. The Government can say that 'because of the attitude of the Pakistan President, we could not be prepared earlier.' But Sir, this is an argument which has to be rejected. We have seen how relentlessly campaign had been carried on by the Pakistan President before he came; and how we had tried to start the Media propaganda, if I may use that expression, before even he arrived here. It cannot be said: "We did not know what was to be discussed."

Sir, if we could not be prepared, then the dates should not have been fixed until we were prepared. According to us, an unprepared for Summit is much worse than a delayed Summit. My party, for a long time, has been trying to impress upon the Government, the necessity to have bilateral discussion. We have been saying that there should be talks, even when the party to which our hon. External Affairs Minister belong has been saying that 'No, they should not talk to a dictator'. We said that we have to bring the two countries closer and the people of these countries should come closer to each other. There is no other forum where we can exchange our views. SAARC is not functioning, and there is no alternative to start a dialogue or to have a talk. After all, the problems of the two countries are similar. There are hunger, poverty, illiteracy, lack of development, unemployment; and we are wasting our scarce resources in trying to see eyeball to eyeball. We had already indulged in wars which had not benefited Pakistan. We also had to face serious problems.

Sir, of course, the talk was necessary and it is desirable and it should continue. But how did the Prime Minister suddenly decide to invite President of Pakistan? Probably, he was not the President then; he was the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), although the Prime Minister addressed him as President even before he became President. That shows the lack of knowledge of our Government. Now, how did he send the invitation then? This is the way this Government is functioning.

After the fiasco of the cease-fire in Jammu and Kashmir, the Government suddenly decided to withdraw the cease-fire and then gave an invitation to him. We support the invitation. But giving invitation means that the Government would have to be ready, fully prepared. How was the date selected?

Sir, even then we supported this Government. But we believed that this Government would behave like a mature country and not behave in a clumsy and callous manner.

Significantly, there was no dialogue with the Opposition parties. They were never taken into confidence. So far as the cease-fire in Kashmir was concerned, the Government, on its own, declared it. Only once when it appeared in the Press that the Prime Minister and the Home Minister were having differences, then only the Opposition parties were called, and all of them supported the Prime Minister. He was happy that he could deal with his recalcitrant

Home Minister.

Thereafter when the cease-fire was withdrawn, the Opposition Parties were not even told and we had to come to know from the newspapers.

Only five days before the Summit was to start, the Opposition Parties were called. We knew that there was no point in meeting; whatever the Government was to decide, had already been decided. Lest any wrong message would go outside that this is not an effort by the country as a whole or that it was not backed by the Opposition Parties and to avoid any misgivings in the minds of the public or any wrong perceptions, we attended the meeting. All the parties supported the decision of the Government to call the Summit, expressed our support for the talks and gave our constructive suggestions.

On behalf of my Party, when we attended, we said that we welcomed the proposed talks. We said that these two countries should hold talks. The argument that there is a Military Ruler in Pakistan should not be the basis for not having a dialogue, we said. We further said that this was a step in the right direction. We also said that Kashmir would have to be discussed in the meeting. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Sir, the Treasury Benches are vacant. ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What happened to the Members of the Treasury Benches today?

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (CANARA): It looks as if the Government is already gone! ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What happened to the Members of the Treasury Benches today?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, we also stated in that all-party meeting that although in some quarters it was being said that Kashmir should not be discussed, it was unrealistic to say that Kashmir would not be discussed and that it was bound to be discussed in the Summit Meeting. ...(*Interruptions*) We also said that other important issues pertaining to trade and economic relations between the two countries should also be discussed. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI E. AHAMED (MANJERI): Sir, if only half of the Ministry is present here, the House will be full, because there is a jumbo-like Ministry. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (BALLIA, U.P.): Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is a very serious matter. All the benches of the Ruling Party are vacant. Only the allies are present there. A few Members of the Ruling Party may be an exception. Are we going to treat a debate like the Agra Summit in this manner? This is a matter of shame. The hon. Speaker should give some warning to the Government that it should behave like a responsible Government. This is not the way. You may otherwise adjourn the House. What is the purpose of having a discussion? ...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: What happened to the Treasury Benches today?

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: I do not know why Shri Chandra Shekhar, of all the Members, should have any hopes in them. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I have no hopes. But at least you have hopes.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had no hopes; so, I did not attend any of those meetings which he had attended. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : You are much wiser, I know. I always accept it.

Therefore, Sir, it is my duty also to tell Shri Chandra Shekhar whom I hold in highest esteem, that we tried to give constructive suggestions in that meeting. We said that apart from Kashmir, there are many vital issues between the two countries like economic relations, trade and commerce between the two countries, cultural exchanges between the two countries, etc. We said that since there was scope for having wider trade relations and economic relations between the two countries, they should also be looked into and they should also be discussed, apart from people to people relations.

The other issue that we had pointed out in that meeting was that both the countries were nuclear weapon countries.

It poses a great threat to the entire sub-continent. So, we should behave in a very serious and responsible manner. Since now we cannot indulge into arms conflict, to avoid any nuclear confrontation is a matter which should be fully discussed in this meeting. We also said that it is naive to think that in one meeting all the solutions could be achieved or all problems would vanish but it should be a beginning of the process between the two countries to develop good neighbourly relations. Agra meeting should be seen as resumption of dialogue and problems cannot be resolved in one instance. We must continue to pursue the path of dialogue with Pakistan to resolve all outstanding issues. These, I believe, should be treated as very constructive suggestions although we understand that the meeting was a mere ritual, just to tell people that they have consulted the Opposition also. I am sorry that the hon. Prime Minister was not well. He had to undergo an operation. But we have a very competent External Affairs Minister who is also saddled with the Defence Ministry. We have a very wise Home Minister who was a member of the delegation. I do not know whether my sister was a member of the delegation. At least I know my very good friend Jaswant-Ji has little more time since he does not have to go to the world capitals to meet Strobe Talbott. Even then they could have told us as to what was happening. The hon. Prime Minister can be excused for ignoring the Opposition. I know, why they did not do it. They did not call us earlier because they did not have anything to discuss. They did not even know what they are going to say and how they are going to respond to the situation. They also did not know what was happening. The problem is, this Government cannot control the situation. They can only react to the situation that may develop. We did not want to rock the boat. We gave our whole-hearted cooperation and support but it appears that this Government wish to treat the foreign policy matter as their Party matter. The Foreign Policy in this country has ceased to be a National Foreign Policy. We understood at that meeting that no agenda was fixed. Maybe, because they did not know what the Pakistan President wished to discuss. This is an amazing admission of inefficiency. Is this the way diplomacy or the foreign affairs to be conducted? Is this the way a Summit of this nature, which has created such an atmosphere in the country, be held? More than the agenda it seems it was more important as to who was attending the lunch or the dinner. That became more important. The status symbol shifted from Black Cats to invitation to lunch and dinner. We asked them whether they were going to discuss trade relations, economic issues and, they said, they did not know whether the Minister of Industry would be coming or not. Joshi-ji was waiting. If his counterpart was coming, then he would be included in the delegation. We asked, whether the Finance Minister would be coming but they did not know about it. In fact, they did not know anything. Three days later they were going to start talks. I appreciate hon. Prime Minister's absence after what he has gone through. We charge that because of the total unpreparedness or total unprofessional manner in which the talks have been conducted, this Government has abjectly failed. Without even the minimum home work, if I may say so, this Government has totally messed up the matter.

Sir, there is a reference to the preparation of draft joint statement. Paragraph 8 of the hon. Prime Minister's statement says:

> "Despite the obvious differences in our perspectives, we made progress towards bridging the two approaches in draft joint document."

Who are these `we'? "We" means the Government of India. If you are unilaterally preparing a statement which was supposedly to be the joint statement, what sort of discussions were held? We are told that a draft statement was there which had been approved by our Minister of External Affairs. He had put something in single bracket, something in second bracket, and something in third bracket. That is what we have been told. All this is from the newspapers. But was there any agreement regarding the joint statement? What was that agreement? On what issues, did they differ? What were to be the contents of the joint statement? Nothing has come out. We sought to incorporate in the document the structure of a future dialogue process on all issues. Then only it was going to refer

what in future he would like to do including official and summit level meetings. We do not know who made those proposals. We have heard about four or five rounds of discussions between the Prime Minister and the Pakistan President. On what did it rock? I do not know. But now we have found a scapegoat in Shrimati Sushma Swaraj. What can she do? Even as a Minister, she did not know what was happening? Nobody took her into confidence. I do not know why did she go to Agra uninvited. She was asked to manage the media. She could not manage the media. It is because they were being managed by somebody else. Therefore, to make her presence felt she made a statement. She knew nothing. But I sympathise with her. As an intelligent lady, she rightly expressed her hope that apart from Kashmir, something else was being discussed. But now it appears nothing has been discussed. They came here with a well rehearsed plan of dominating the show. We have our great Government of India with -- I do not know how many Ministers; probably they are still much lesser than that of the UP Cabinet not less than 60 Ministers. But just look at the situation here. Shri Ajit Panja was going to be the Minister but now Shri Ajit Singh has become the Minister. It is a wonderful country. Today, our Prime Minister is to act as if he is the Chief Minister of UP. He is concerned with Uttar Pradesh only. That is what is happening. Now I recall Dr. Shyama Prasad Mookherjee's exclamation, namely, India, *i.e.* Bharat, *i.e.,* Uttar Pradesh, and now, of course, Andhra Pradesh. For magical 29 votes, India, *i.e.,* Bharat, *i.e.,* Uttar Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh! This is what is happening. Sir, I do not mean any offence to you.

Sir, is there anything called media management in the matters like this? I do not say that you influence or censor media. But why did Indian media feel that they are being kept out of the channel of information? Nobody understood that the Pakistan President was having a live telecast of his breakfast meeting. It appears that Dr. Prannoy Roy somehow got hold of a copy and he ran with it and telecast it over the Star TV. Sir, can you think of a more amateurish manner in which Government has acted? I do not know what should we expect from this Government.

Sir, I remember I was also trying to find out, at about 12 o'clock in the mid night or at 1 o'clock in the early morning when the Pakistan President left our country after the meeting, what had happened. This is wonderful management. You are seeing off a person after 1 o'clock in the night.

Now Sir, there was a statement made and the whole world was waiting for the outcome of these talks. We heard the spokesperson of the Government of India. It seems that every word bore the stamp of our External Affairs Minister on how to say nothing in a matter like this. As I said, brevity sometimes has virtue but not in matters like this. It was pathetic - the way things were kept back from the country. You may remember that after the performance at the breakfast, the Prime Minister's earlier statement was circulated among the Press. What is this? Are we safe in this country to leave our affairs in the hands of this Government? As a result what happened? They parted company without even a handshake for the purpose of taking a photograph. That would have given a message.

However, I hope everything is not lost. Our distinguished External Affairs Minister has expressed hope that the talks will continue and this is not the end of the road. We also feel that whatever inefficiency you have shown last time would not be repeated in future and be prepared for it. Shri Jaswant Singh has said that efforts for peace would continue and the Agra Summit was part of the continuous effort on India's part, that we should endeavour to build trust and confidence, building upon the existing compacts of Simla and Lahore. We share his hope. In spite of all the failures on their part, let us hope that we shall continue our efforts specially because the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has also said that the talks altogether did not fail. We believe in that. As I have said earlier, we have vested interests. The people of these two countries have vested interests in maintaining peace and friendship and we shall try to achieve them. Sir, we demand that this Government should be fully prepared when it goes for talks next time.

A very important thing has been completely jettisoned and I must lodge my strong protest against the attitude of the Home Minister and the Government of India with regard to the demand of autonomy of Jammu and Kashmir. They have acceded to India on a certain definite basis. Article 370 represents the country's commitment to the people of J&K and is based upon the Treaty of Accession. We have been saying that utmost autonomy should be provided to the people of Kashmir. They must be integrated in the mainstream. Advantage is being taken by reason of feelings of alienation among the people of Kashmir. We must salute them for they fought valiantly. They have acceded to India and they have not surrendered to the calls of religion, bigotry and fanaticism. They have rejected the two-nation theory as secular India has. But their minimum demands have not been looked into. Now, what has been stated recently by the hon. Home Minister? It only creates a situation which will be exploited by those who are on the other side of the border. Of course, we want that cross-border terrorism or proxy war should be discussed among the two countries. But unless you have the willing support of the people of Kashmir, their direct participation in the affairs, there will be greater and greater problems. New incidents have taken place. We know that this is a matter which has to be dealt with carefully.

We want that the process which has started should continue. Our greatest handicap today is that we have a Government that behaves in an *ad-hoc* manner. See what is happening in every sphere! Now, we have a situation

that even the Prime Minister feels like resigning. He had to be persuaded to continue. He had expressed his desire and intention to quit. It is because of the motley combination which is behaving in different manners. Nobody knows who are the constituents of the NDA at a given point of time. Nobody knows what are their primary objectives because there is no unity of thought, unity of action and unity of decision amongst the different constituents of the NDA. Therefore, it has become all the more necessary that whenever the Prime Minister decides to go to Islamabad, he should go not only with the support of the people of this country but also with full preparation and with the objective of arriving at a settlement. Of course, it should not be at the cost of India's national interest. But, I am sure, that in the absence of any other possibility of coming closer, we have to continue with the process of dialogue and talk. I am sure that everybody will join me in wishing the Government all success. This Government is squarely responsible for the failure of this Summit, although the intransigence of the Pakistan's President has contributed significantly to this. After all, we are a mature nation. We have got very experienced leaders who are in charge of this. But I must once again condemn the ineptitude, the inefficiency, the callousness and the clumsy manner in which this Government has acted in dealing with the matters of Summit. And they must give an explanation to the country through this House as to why there was such failure on their part. They must take the House into confidence and tell us about the resolve in going and taking part in the future discussion with full preparation, so that this country's interest and the interest of the people of these two countries could be safeguarded and peace can be restored to the sub-continent.

16.53 hrs. (श्रीमती मार्ग्रेट आल्वा पीठासीन हुईं)

श्री चन्द्रशेखर (बलिया, उ.प्र.) : सभापति महोदय, मैं सरकार के लिए और विशेाकर विदेश मंत्री जी के प्रति सहानुभूति प्रकट करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। मुझे उनसे कोई शिकायत नहीं है। शिकायत केवल एक ही है कि जिस भााा का उपयोग पाकिस्तान के जनरल कर रहे थे, उस भााा मे नहीं, लेकिन अपने विचारों को उसी स्पटता से रखने में वह और उनके प्रधान मंत्री जी असफल रहे। बार-बार हमसे यह कहा गया कि जो कुछ कश्मीर में हो रहा है, वह आजादी की लड़ाई है। हम यह नहीं समझ पाये कि हमारे प्रतिनिधि मंडल ने उन्हें यह क्यों नहीं बताया कि कश्मीर में आजादी की लड़ाई 1947 में हुई थी, जब देश को धर्म के नाम पर बांटा गया था तो कश्मीर के लोगों ने जिन्ना साहब के पाकिस्तान में जाना स्वीकार नहीं किया, महात्मा गांधी के हिन्दुस्तान में आना स्वीकार किया था। वही आजादी की लड़ाई शेख अब्दुल्ला के नेतृत्व में हुई थी और उस लड़ाई के कारण ही आज कश्मीर भारत का अंग है। जनरल मुशर्रफ को उस लड़ाई का ज्ञान नहीं होगा, लेकिन कम से कम हम यह आशा करते थे कि भारत का जो प्रतिनिधि मंडल था, वह उन्हें इस बात की याद दिलाता, लेकिन उस बात की याद नहीं दिलाई गई। यही नहीं दुनिया के दूसरे देश हमें बार-बार यह कहते रहे कि किसी तरह समझौता कर लीजिए। ये वही लोग हैं जिन्होंने उस समय देश को दो हिस्सो में बांटने के लिए अपने तीर चलाये थे।

मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि कश्मीर का मामला या हिन्दुस्तान-पाकिस्तान का मामला इतना साधारण नहीं है जितना हम सोचते हैं। मैं बड़ी विनम्रता के साथ दादा की बात से अपने को सहमत नहीं कर पाता। क्या हो गया है विरोधी पार्टियों को? सरकार के बारे में कुछ कहूं, उसके पहले मैं निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि किस आधार पर आप लोग गए थे बात करने के लिए? किस आधार पर आप गए थे मुशर्रफ साहब की चाय में हिस्सा लेने के लिए, किस आधार पर आप गए थे इस उम्मीद को लेकर कि इससे कोई बड़ा फैसला होगा, हम एक कदम आगे बढ़ेंगे? मैं मुशर्रफ साहब की बात से पूरी तरह असहमत हूं उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा, लेकिन एक बात कहनी पड़ेगी कि एक शब्द भी आगरा में वह नहीं कहा जो उसके पहले वह पाकिस्तान में नहीं कह चुके थे। जो बात उन्होंने इस्लामाबाद में कही, वही बात आगरा में कही, लौटकर गए तो वहां जाकर भी फिर उन्हीं बातों को दोहराया। उन्होंने स्पट रूप से कह दिया था कि हम कश्मीर के अलावा और कोई बात नहीं करेंगे। किस आधार पर विरोधी दल के नेताओं ने यह सलाह दी थी जसवन्त सिंह जी को और वाजपेयी जी को कि आप दूसरे सवालों पर भी चर्चा कीजिए और मैं नहीं समझता कि किस आधार पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने और हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी ने देश को यह सपना दिखाया था कि और सवालों पर भी चर्चा होगी, कश्मीर का भी सवाल हम उठाएंगे। यह बात मैं इसलिए कहता हूं कि बार-बार जनरल साहब ने इस बात को सारी दुनिया के सामने कहा और वह इस हद तक गए कि हमें शायद निमंत्रण इसलिए मिला है कि कोई बाहरी देश हमारे देश को मजबूर कर रहा है इस न्यौते को देने के लिए। इसके बावजूद भी हम गए, हमने उनको निमंत्रण दिया और निमंत्रण भी किन परिस्थितियों में दिया? इससे पहले सार्क की दो-चार मीटिंगें स्थगित हो गई थीं। सार्क को बनाने के लिए हम लोग ही जिम्मेदार हैं। जब सारी दुनिया में आंचलिक सहयोग की बात चल रही थी, जब यूरोप के देश एक हो रहे थे, जब मैक्सिको, कनाडा और अमेरिका एक हो रहे थे, जब आसियान के देश आपस में मिलकर सहयोग बढ़ा रहे थे, उस समय हमने सार्क की स्थापना की थी। सार्क ऐसा फोरम था जहां पर हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जनरल साहब से मिल सकते थे बिना किसी हल्ला-गुल्ला के, बिना शोर-शराबे के और बिना किसी अपमान के बात कर सकते थे। उस समय हमें कहा गया कि हम जनतंत्र में विश्वास करने वाले लोग हैं, हम लोकशाही में विश्वास करने वाले लोग हैं, किसी अधिनायक के साथ नहीं बैठ सकते। इसके पहले भी सार्क की मीटिंगों में बहुत से लोग गए थे जिन्होंने जनरल के साथ बातें की थीं। मैं उन घटनाओं को याद दिलाने की जरूरत नहीं समझता। मणि शंकर अय्यर जी कभी साथ गए होंगे पाकिस्तान के जनरल के साथ और बंग्लादेश के जनरल के साथ तो मैंने ही बैठकर बात की थी। ऊंचे आदर्शों की बात हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने की। भारत के लोगों ने बड़ी तारीफ की, हमारे समाचार-पत्रों ने कहा कि इतने बड़े जनतंत्र का हिमायती प्रधान मंत्री अचानक एक दिन कह गया कि जनरल साहब को निमंत्रण दे दिया गया और निमंत्रण देने के बाद विरोधी पार्टियों को बुला लिया गया और इन लोगों ने भी कहा बड़ा भारी काम हो रहा है, एक नई शुरूआत हो रही है।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल) : हम नहीं गए थे।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : जो भी गए होंगे। एक नई शुरूआत विदेश नीति में हो रही है ऐसा कहा। भारत और पाकिस्तान के रिश्ते बदलने के लिए एक नया कदम उठाया जा रहा है। मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि यह सपने कहां से दिखाई दे रहे थे। क्योंकि जो भी जनरल साहब कह रहे थे, इस्लामाबाद से जो भी वहां अखबारों में छप रहा था, जो उनकी भाव-भंगिमा थी, जिस तरह की बातें चली आ रही थीं उससे स्पट था कि वह कश्मीर का सवाल उठाएंगे। लेकिन मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि कभी भी हमारे मन में क्या संकोच था कि लोगों की कुर्बानी के बाद, लोगों के बलिदान के बाद, शेख अबदुल्ला के प्रयासों के बाद जिस कश्मीर ने हमारे देश में आना स्वीकार किया था, उस कश्मीर के सवाल को हम नज़रंदाज़ कर देंगे अपनी दृटि से। याद रखिये कश्मीर हमारे लिए कोई जमीन का सवाल नहीं है, कश्मीर हमारे लिए मौलिक सिद्धांतों, मौलिक आदर्शों का सवाल है। कश्मीर ही ऐसा इलाका है जिसके कारण हम यह कह सके कि हिन्दुस्तान एक धर्मनिरपेक्ष देश है। सैक्यूलरिज्म में हजारों वर्षों से हमारे देश की जो परंपरा रही है कि मजहब अलग अलग हो सकते हैं लेकिन भगवान, खुदा तो एक ही है, मंजिल जब एक है तो कौन राही किस राह से वहां पहुंचेगा इसके लिए हम झगड़ा नहीं करेंगे और यह बात साबित की थी कश्मीर के लोगों ने,

17.00 hrs.

और समाप्त की थी, शेख अब्दुल्ला ने यह बात समाप्त की थी, 1947 के लड़ाई के दिनों में और इसीलिए उसके बाद जो संविधान बना, उसमें हमने धारा 370 को स्वीकार किया, लेकिन यह बात क्यों नहीं की गई, यह बात क्यों नहीं समझाई गई, दुनिया के सामने इन सवालों को क्यों नहीं रखा गया ? जनरल साहब के स्वागत में

हम इतने प्रफुल्लित थे, समझते थे कि हमारे पास तो कहने के लिए कुछ भी नहीं है, जो कुछ है वह सिर्फ मुशर्रफ साहब के पास कहने को है।

सभापति महोदया, बड़ी चर्चा होती है श्रीमती सुामा स्वराज की और कहा जाता है कि ये कैसे बिना बुलाए चली गईं, बिना निमंत्रण कैसे उन्होंने अपना बयान दिया, मैं आज नहीं कह रहा हूं, जब समाचार पत्रों के लोगों ने मुझसे पूछा कि सुामा स्वराज बिना बुलाए गई थीं या निमंत्रण मिलने पर गई थीं, मैंने कहा यह मुझे मालूम नहीं, लेकिन सुामा स्वराज इस देश की एक प्रवक्ता थीं, वे मुशर्रफ साहब की प्रवक्ता नहीं थीं और उन्होंने जो बयान दिया, उसमें सचाई कितनी है, मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन उन्होंने इस देश की गरिमा को, इस देश के गौरव को, इस देश के मान-सम्मान को बचाने का काम किया। मैंने उस समय अखबारों में बयान दिया था, उनका मजाक बनाएं, यह ठीक नहीं है। अगर कोई जनरल चिटनिस लूट नहीं करता, तो हमारे लोगों को अनुशासन की कमी की बात दिखाई पड़ती है, लेकिन हम वह दिन भूल जाते हैं जब हमारे प्रधान मंत्री के लाहौर जाने पर वहां के तीनों जनरल नहीं आते हैं और यही मुशर्रफ वहां पर आना मंजूर नहीं करते हैं।

सभापति महोदय, मैं समझता हूं कि समझौते हों, मैं चाहता हूं कि आपसी बातचीत हो, लेकिन बातचीत के समय हमेशा हमें याद रखना चाहिए कि अपने को नीचे झुका कर, अपनी गरिमा को घटाकर, हम कोई बातचीत नहीं कर सकते। बातचीत जब दो देशों के बीच में होती है, तो हमें हमेशा ख्याल रखना चाहिए कि उधर लोग क्या सोच रहे हैं।

महोदया, हमने एटम बम बनाया, अणु बम बनाया, बड़ी खुशियां मनाई गईं। हमारे जो बड़े प्रबल मंत्री हैं, जो हमेशा सरकार की कमजोरी देखकर, आपको बल देने का काम करते हैं, उन्होंने तो इतना तक कहा था कि हम प्रो-एक्टिव पालिटिक्स करेंगे, कश्मीर में हम लड़ाई लड़ने के लिए तैयार हैं। पांच-सात दिन के बाद मैंने अकेले इस संसद में कहा था कि बड़ा अपराध हो रहा है हमारे देश की जनता के साथ, इस क्षेत्र की जनता के साथ, पाकिस्तान की जनता के साथ, हमने कहा कि अणु बम सुरक्षा का हथियार नहीं, यह आक्रमण का हथियार है। यह अपने देश में इस्तेमाल नहीं हो सकता, यह दूसरे देश में इस्तेमाल होगा, लेकिन कभी आपने सोचा है कि अगर आप लाहौर पर बम गिराएंगे, तो अमृतसर का क्या होगा ?

लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री जी, पता नहीं जसवन्त सिंह जी ने आपको सलाह दी या पता नहीं किस ने सलाह दी कि आप बस लेकर लाहौर चले गए और अखबारों में छपा कि आपने जवाहर लाल जी को भी पीछे छोड़ दिया, शायद आपको मालूम नहीं होगा, शायद आपने कभी सोचा नहीं होगा और आप लाहौर चले गए, मैंने कहा यह खतरनाक खेल है। इसी संसद में मैंने कहा है। यह मैं आज नहीं कह रहा हूं, मैंने उस समय भी कहा कि लाहौर जाकर आपने खतरा मोल ले लिया है और हमें कहीं और खतरनाक स्थिति का सामना न करना पड़े। मैं नहीं जनता था कि तीन महीने के अंदर कारगिल हो जाएगा और कारगिल में आप याद रखिए, हमने लोगों को बड़ा उत्साह दिया, शहीदों की शहादत पर बड़ा गर्व किया, अभिमान किया, उनकी चिताओं पर फूल चढ़ाए, लेकिन सभापति जी, क्या नतीजा निकला, एक देश का राट्रपति, इसी संसद के केन्द्रीय कक्ष में कह गया कि कारगिल से पाकिस्तानी आपकी वजह से वापस नहीं गए, उस फौज को वहां से वापस करने में हमारी जरूरत पड़ी थी। उस समय क्षमा कीजिए, उनका स्वागत करना सरकार की मजबूरी थी, लेकिन विरोधी पक्ष को उस दावत में जाने की होड़ लगाने की क्या जरूरत थी, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता ? क्योंकि जब हम यहां बात करते हैं, तो हमें सोचना चाहिए।

सभापति महोदया, अभी सोमनाथ दादा जो कह रहे थे, मैं उनसे सहमत हूं कि विदेश नीति केवल एक पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, राट्र की मर्यादा का सवाल होता है कि हम अपनी विदेश नीति किस प्रकार से चला रहे हैं। अचानक एक दिन खबर मिली कि हमारे विरोधी पक्ष के लोग वहां के उच्चायुक्त की दावत पर चाय पर नहीं जाएंगे, क्योंकि उन्होंने हुरियत को निमंत्रण दे रखा है, अब चाय पर कौन किसको बुलाए या नहीं बुलाए, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता, लेकिन आपने एक इश्यू बना लिया और विरोधी पार्टी के लोगों ने कहा कि हम नहीं जाएंगे। शिव राज जी, आपकी पार्टी ने कहा कि अगर उनका एक प्रतिनिधि जाएगा, तो हमारा भी एक प्रतिनिधि जाएगा। यह बात जब समझ में आई, तो हमारे एन.डी.ए. के मित्रों ने सोचा शायद दुनिया की नजर में हम पीछे न रह जाएं, एन.डी.ए. ने कहा कि हम बिलकुल नहीं जाएंगे।

जब उन्होंने कहा हम नहीं जाएंगे तो विरोधी पार्टियों ने कहा अब हम जरूर जाएंगे। क्या यही एकता है? क्या यही विदेश नीति में एक तरह से सोचने की बात है? जिस समय हुर्रियत के लोगों से जनरल मुशर्रफ मिल रहे थे, उस समय हमारे विरोधी दल के प्रमुख नेता कौरीडोर में बैठ कर इंतजार कर रहे थे कि उनको भी एक बार मिलने का मौका मिल जाए। यह टी.वी. पर दिखाया गया। क्या भारत की एकता, सम्मान, मर्यादा के लिए उस समय हमारे दिल में यह एहसास हुआ या नहीं? मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा प्रधान मंत्री जी, हम इन बातों को इसलिए कह रहे हैं कि हम सब एक ही तरह के हैं, एक ही परिवार के लोग हैं। जब हमने बम बनाया तब वे भी हमारे ही परिवार के लोग हैं, उन्होंने भी पांच की जगह छः बम फोड़ दिए। आपके सहयोगी मित्र आज लड़ाई की बात नहीं करते। आज लड़ाई की बात दूसरी जगहों पर होती है। मैं उसमें ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता, मैं उस बारे में कुछ कहना नहीं चाहता लेकिन फिर आपको गलत सलाह दी जा रही है।

अभी सोमनाथ दादा बोल रहे थे। मैं उनकी बात सुनते हुए अवाक रह गया। उन्होंने कहा, जरूर जाइए, इस रिश्ते को कायम रखिए। हमारे मित्र जसवन्त जी बड़े आशा वादी हैं। आशावादिता में वे फिर इस्लामाबाद जाने के लिए तैयार हो रहे होंगे, कह रहे होंगे जाइए। हम भी मानते हैं कि बातचीत के अलावा कोई दूसरा रास्ता नहीं है। लेकिन बातचीत जब तक जसवन्त जी करें, मुझे कोई ऐतराज नहीं है, जब तक विदेश सचिव करें, कोई ऐतराज नहीं है लेकिन देश के प्रधान मंत्री को इस्लामाबाद ले जाने से पहले सौ बार सोच कर जाइए, कहीं आगरा से बुरी बात न हो जाए। यह बात हम इसलिए कह रहे हैं, हमारा कोई विरोध नहीं है, हम समझते हैं कि बातचीत के लिए देश को हमेशा तैयार रहना चाहिए लेकिन देश के प्रधान मंत्री को, इसलिए कि हमने कह दिया है और प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपने बड़ी उदारतावश न्यौता स्वीकार भी कर लिया है। उदारता वाली बात उदार लोगों के साथ चलती है। 'शठे शाठयम् समाचरेत्', शठ के साथ उदारता नहीं चलती। हम नहीं कहते कि लड़ाई कीजिए, हम नहीं कहते कि झगड़ा कीजिए लेकिन कहीं ऐसा न हो कि दुनिया के लोग समझें कि हम इस बात के लिए उतावले हैं कि किसी तरह से समझौता हो जाए। समझौता किस बात पर हो? पाकिस्तान के जनरल साहब, पहले के नेता शायद पाकिस्तान की बात इस कड़ाई से नहीं कहते थे कि कश्मीर अकेला मुद्दा है जिस मुद्दे पर हम बात करेंगे और सारे मुद्दे तो गौण हैं। आगरा में बैठ कर अपने भााण में सम्पादकों के बीच उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा, हमने भी उसे सुना था। उसके बाद भी आपको आशा लगी हुई थी कि किसी न किसी समझौते पर राह निकल जाएगी। लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूं विदेश मंत्री जी, उनके भााण को आपने कैसे सीधे प्रसारण होने की अनुमति दी? कहां गए थे आपके खुफिया विभाग, कहां गए थे इन्फौर्मेशन, सुामा जी, आपका विभाग क्या कर रहा था? आपको पता भी नहीं चला और सारा भााण सीधा सारी दुनिया को ब्रॉडकास्ट हो रहा था। हम चुपचाप, जैसे सेमनाथ दादा ने कहा, अगर एक पत्रकार महोदय कोशिश नहीं करते तो शायद आपके दूरदर्शन को उसकी कॉपी भी नहीं मिलती। यह हालत कैसे पहुंच गई? सभापति महोदय, मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि यह हालत है जिस हालत में हम एक ऐसे पड़ोसी से सम्पर्क करना चाहते हैं जिस पड़ोसी के इरादे साफ नहीं हैं। प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपने बड़ी उदारता से उनको न्यौता दे दिया। न्यौता देने के बाद उन्होंने तुरन्त क्या काम किया। आपने पहले कहा था कि वे चुने हुए प्रतिनिधि नहीं हैं, उनसे बात नहीं करेंगे।â€¦(व्यवधान) आतंकवाद की छोड़ दीजिए। वह उनके रोके न रुकेगा न चलाए चलेगा, हम लोग ही रोकेंगे और हम इतने असमर्थ नहीं हैं कि उसे रोक नहीं सकते। उसके लिए हम उनसे निवेदन करना इस देश के सम्मान के खिलाफ समझते हैं। मैं नहीं मानता कि पाकिस्तान चाहे और हम रोकना चाहें तो इस देश का आतंकवाद नहीं रुकेगा। यह हमारी कमजोरी की निशानी है, इसके अलावा और कुछ नहीं है। मैं ऐसा समझता हूं कि कठिनाइयां जरूर होंगी, कठोर निर्णय लेने होंगे, अप्रिय बातें करनी होंगी। लेकिन क्या यह देश इतना असमर्थ है कि पाकिस्तान या दुनिया का कोई दूसरा देश हमारे देश में आकर हिंसा का माहौल बनाए और हम सहन करते रहें? लेकिन अजीब हालत है। वहां हम कहां चले गए थे जब यह बात हुई। ज्यों ही न्यौता गया, उसके चार-छः दिन के अंदर उन्होंने अपने को प्रैज़ीडैंट डिक्लेयर कर दिया। हमें दुख और लज्जा के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज अकेला हिन्दुस्तान है जो उनको प्रैज़ीडैंट मानता है। वहां का चीफ जस्टिस, वहां की न्यायपालिका नहीं मानती,

वहां की विरोधी पार्टियां नहीं मानतीं, दुनिया के देश उनको प्रेसीडेंट नहीं मानते और यही नहीं, प्रधान मंत्री जी, भूल करने के लिए आप भी मजबूर थे। पिछले 2-3 वर्षों से, मुझे अवधि मालूम नहीं है, कभी हुर्रियत से बात, कभी हिजबुल मुजाहिदीन से बात, कश्मीर के मुख्यमंत्री से बिना सलाह किये हुए, बिना बात किये हुए आप इन

लोगों को न्यौता देते हैं। नकाबपोश लोगों के साथ हमारे गृह सचिव फोटो खिंचवाते हैं। क्या यह हमारी कमजोरी का द्योतक नहीं था? इन सारी कमजोरियों के बावजूद आप समझते हैं कि वह जनरल, जो कारगिल के लिए जिम्मेदार है, वह आपसे समझौता कर लेगा? आज फिर अगर आपके मन में मोह हो तो उस मोह को जसवन्त सिंह जी के साथ ट्रांसफर कर दीजिए, अपने पास मत रखिये। जरूरत पड़े तो सुामा जी को भेज दीजिए, आप मत जाइये। वे लोग जिस भााा को समझते हैं, वह भााा दूसरी है। वह भााा छल कपट की है, छल कपट मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूं, क्योंकि कूटनीति का मुझे दूसरा अर्थ मालूम नहीं है। छल कपट इसलिए कह रहा हूं कि कूटनीति की भााा जो लोग जानते हैं, सुामा जी कूटनीति की दक्ष तो नहीं हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने एक तीर जरूर ऐसा चलाया कि जनरल साहब उससे व्यथित हो गये, मुझे कम से कम इससे प्रसन्नता है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा, दादा, आप बहुत नेक सलाह देते हैं, मैं आपके नेतृत्व को मानता हूं, कृपा करके इस सरकार को और गलत रास्ते पर चलने के लिए आप कोशिश मत कीजिए। इनको यह मत कहिये कि चले जाइये, बड़ा अच्छा काम है। â€¦(व्यवधान) नहीं जा रहे हैं। हम नहीं सोचते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी जाएंगे, पहले भी मुझे स्वीकार नहीं था, लेकिन एक दिन मैं उनके स्वास्थ्य के बारे में पूछने गया, तब उन्होंने हमको जो कहा था, वह मैं यहां पर नहीं कहूंगा। उस दिन हमें बड़ी आशा बंधी थी कि प्रधान मंत्री जी ठीक राह पर हैं, मगर पता नहीं, किसका असर आगरा में पड़ा कि वहां जाकर बिल्कुल बदल गये, आगरा में जाकर ऐला लगा कि सब कुछ ठीक हो रहा है। आप इस जनरल के चक्कर में मत पड़िये। मैं और बातें नहीं कहना चाहूंगा। मैं इस सवाल पर कोई भेद पैदा नहीं करना चाहता, मैं कोई विवाद खड़ा नहीं करना चाहता, लेकिन आप शुरू से भूल कर रहे हैं, चाहे आतंकवादियों से किसी तरह बात करने की कोशिश हो और किसी तरह मुशर्रफ साहब को बुलाकर शान्तिदूत बनने की कोशिश हो, ये दोनों नाकामयाब होने वाली हैं, ये दोनों देशों को विनाश की ओर ले जाएंगी।

मुझे विश्वास है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी और हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी आगरा से सबक लेंगे और उसी भूल को फिर से नहीं दोहराएंगे।

SHRI K. YERRANNAIDU (SRIKAKULAM): Madam Chairperson, my party welcomes the initiative taken by the hon. Prime Minister to invite General Parvez Musharaff. The relations between India and Pakistan have acquired singnificance over the last 50 years for peace in the region. As we know, the root cause of the problem has been there since the Partition. Since then, India and Pakistan are having strained relations.

So far, there have been 16 summit-level discussions, including the Agra Summit, between the leaders of the two countries. The Shimla Agreement in 1972 laid strong foundations for resolving issues between the two countries. Everybody is talking that the Agra Summit has been a failure. If it is a failure, what has happened to the 15 summits held so far? Even the high-level delegations led by popular and elected leaders and also the military level discussions took place earlier 15 times. This is a continuous process. The Agra Summit is so a part of that process.

India's regard and commitment for peace and friendly relations with all the neighbouring countries are well established. We are always ready for negotiations with the neighbouring countries.

Both the countries are developing countries. We have to concentrate on development of the economy. There is no peace in the South-Asian Region. I am requesting the hon. Prime Minister, through you, that cross-border terrorism is a vital thing. We have to condemn it. We have to stop cross-border terrorism at any cost. There are different issues. Kashmir is a core issue for Pakistan. Cross-border terrorism is a core issue for us. Other than these two issues, there are so many other issues for continuing the talks even at the ministerial level, Secretary-level or diplomatic level. These issues relate to culture, economy and even post and telegraph.

There are so many other bilateral issues which can be negotiated, as also cricket. Without discussing all these areas, everybody is confining on one issue, the problem will not be settled. That is my party"""""s view.

The Prime Minister also exchanged views before and after the Agra Summit with the leaders of all the political parties, with media-persons, with everybody. We have also given some suggestions before and even after the Agra Summit. My party has even welcomed proposal for the invitation given by Gen. Musharraf and accepted by the Prime Minister. We have to continue the bilateral talks with Pakistan. We have to maintain peace in the South Asian Region

The way the Pakistan President conducted himself before and during the Agra Summit here certainly adversely affected the Agra Summit. I only hope that Pakistan leadership will become wiser and more responsible in course of time and will contribute in resolving the outstanding issues.

Kashmir is, no doubt, an emotional issue for both the countries. The major challenge is to resolve such issues in an appropriate manner as per the will of the people of both the countries. I have reasons to believe that people of the two countries want to live in peace. In both countries, people want peace, so we have to educate, we have to go in that direction. But now, we are spending a lot of money, that is, 30 per cent of our exchequer is spent on Defence. Even, Pakistan is doing the same thing. The recent report shows that and the IMF is monitoring it every week. This is the scenario in India and Pakistan.

So, in this present situation, we have to develop our economy, we have to restore peace. Even if a consensus is not arrived at between both the countries, there is no joint statement, there is no agreement, the talks should be continued for restoration of peace in the South Asian Region. My party welcomed the initiative and welcomed the acceptance of invitation by the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister should go to Islamabad.

Everybody is saying that there was no structural agenda, there was no homework or no preparation was done. In my view, every politician, every citizen of this country knows the relationship between these two countries. The 1972 Simla Agreement is the base. It is a good agreement also and basing on that we are initiating our talks. Then, what type of preparation do we need? I would like to this from this august House. Everybody knows everything. So,

when they say that there was no structural agenda, there was no homework, etc. my party does not accept that. We have to continue the bilateral talks, we have to restore peace in the South Asian Region.

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA (TURA): Madam Chairperson, I am not going to repeat all the points that had already been made very eloquently by the previous speakers, particularly, Shri Madhavrao Scindia. I will try to deal the topic from a different perspective.

After the Summit when Gen. Musharraf arrived at Islamabad, he declared and I quote: "I have returned empty handed". I want to put a question whether it is a true statement. Did Gen. Musharraf return to Pakistan empty handed? If he is talking about himself, if he is talking about his personal interest or personal gain, I think he is making a wrong statement. If he is talking in terms of the welfare of the people of Pakistan, I think, he is right. He has returned to Pakistan empty handed for the people of Pakistan.

But for himself, I think, he got everything. Why did he come here? I really do not know why our Prime Minister invited him. I cannot reconcile that point even now. I asked the Prime Minister whether it was not in haste to invite him. But the invitation from our Prime Minister was such a God-sent opportunity for Gen. Musharraf. He came here not to solve the Kashmir problem. He came here not to normalise or improve the relationship between the two countries. He did not come here to get something for the people of Pakistan. He came here to get legitimacy of his coup, he came here to get legitimacy of his self-proclamed Presidentship of Pakistan and he got everything from us. He went back to his country with that recognition, with that legitimacy, with that kind of glamour and with that kind of international attention. How could Gen. Musharraf go back to Pakistan with something for the people when he had no intention of getting anything for the people?

He says: `Poverty is not an issue, peace is not an issue, progress is not an issue, development is not an issue, and harmonising the relationship between India and Pakistan hardly matters. What are you talking about? People to people contact! What do you mean by confidence building measures? Forget about all these. These are irrelevant. What is relevant is Kashmir - step by step approach. You recognise Kashmir as a core issue, then you proceed. If you do not recognise Kashmir as a core issue, then everything else is irrelevant.' He is a clever man. I think, he has been able to show to the people of Pakistan that he is concerned about Pakistan. I do not think that he is concerned about the people of Pakistan at all but he is concerned about his Chair and he is concerned about his power.

I know − Shri Yerrannaidu has just made this point − that the people of both the countries want peace; the people of both the countries want reduction in defence expenditure so that poverty alleviation can be stepped up. But Gen. Musharraf does not want it. I have with me the full Budget of Pakistan for the year 2001-2002. They have a deficit Budget of 10.5 billion Pakistani rupees. The debt servicing expenditure is 329.2 billion Pakistani rupees; the Defence expenditure is 131.6 billion Pakistani rupees; these two items make 460 billion Pakistani rupees. What is their developmental expenditure? It is 130 billion Pakistani rupees. As against the debt servicing expenditure of 329 billion and as against the Defence expenditure of 131 billion, the developmental expenditure in Pakistan for the year 2001-2002 is just 130 billion Pakistani rupees. Does he care for his Budget? He does not.

Well, I do not want to go into so many other points. I do not want to criticise the Government any more, but the point which is relevant at the moment is, how do we proceed. The External Affairs Minister has said that the caravan of peace would continue its march.

The Prime Minister said that we have to go on with re-engagement. The point is, how do we proceed with the caravan of peace? How do we re-engage ourselves with Pakistan? I really do not know. After all Pakistan's bottomline is that there is no cross-border terrorism. It is a freedom struggle. He said, "It is a freedom struggle". He says: "LoC is the problem and not a solution; unless you accept Kashmir as a core issue, I cannot move an inch." Now, if that is the bottomline of Pakistan, then how do we proceed? I do not see any way that we can proceed. I think, the House has very rightly cautioned the Prime Minister of India in asking him whether he is really making a visit to Pakistan. We are not against his visit. Go ahead. But the point is, what will you do there? One Summit has already taken place. Everybody said that it was going to be a historic Summit.

When the Prime Minister had taken the meeting of the leaders of the political parties on the 9th of July on this Summit, I refused to wish the Prime Minister best of luck. If you remember, everybody was saying, 'I wish you best of luck'. I did not see any reason why I should wish him best of luck on that day because I knew what was coming. When I asked the Foreign Minister where was the agenda, the Foreign Minister said, 'Well we have submitted eight points agenda to Pakistan but they have not responded so far'. On 9th of July, there was no agenda. I asked the Foreign Minister what was the composition of Pakistani delegation; how many people are coming? What is our delegation composed of? The Foreign Minister said, 'Our delegation composed of the Prime Minister, the Home Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Commerce and Industry Minister and the Finance Minister.' I think that is all. I am not rebutting. From Pakistan side, they had not disclosed as yet on the 9th of July. I asked this question. Is it correct

that Pakistan delegation will compose of only General Musharraf and Foreign Minister, Abdul Sattar? The Foreign Minister said, 'I have no idea.' I said that that was going to be the composition. The Home Minister of Pakistan is not coming. Who is going to talk about cross-border terrorism which is the core issue as far as we are concerned? The Commerce Minister of Pakistan is not a member of the team. Then, who is going to talk about bilateral relations? Economic co-operation is so important. And it so happened that nothing was discussed.

General Musharraf was very proud to say well 90 per cent of their talks was on Kashmir and rest 10 per cent must have been on snacks and tea. From that point of view, this is the first time, perhaps, in the history of world diplomacy where a Summit between the two Heads of Governments was held without preparation and without agenda. What do we do? I do not know what advice to give to the Government.

But I think this Kargil Review Committee Report should be our guidance for future. In Chapter III of the Report, what we should keep in mind is clearly spelt out and I quote:

> "Pakistan's behaviour has been driven by a desire to avenge its defeat in 1971 and subsequent discomfiture in Siachen. "
>
> "In this context, Pakistan's strategy vis-à-vis India has had three broad interconnected stands: undermining the Simla Agreement and internationalising the Kashmir issue; waging a proxy war against India to tie up the Indian Army in counter-insurgency operations; and pursuing a nuclear programme to achieve strategic parity with India in using nuclear capability to seize Kashmir at an appropriate opportunity."

This is the approach of Pakistan.

Is the Simla Agreement not relevant? What did Mr. Abdul Sattar say before coming to India in Islamabad? The Foreign Minister of Pakistan said: 'How long does it take for an agreement to lapse - fifty-four years since the UN Resolution or 29 years since the Simla Agreement?' This was what the Foreign Minister of Pakistan said: 'If the UN Resolution has lapsed, the Simla Agreement has lapsed and Lahore Declaration has also lapsed.' So, what is left now? There is no question of confidence building measures; no question of bilateral trade, no question of having only a bilateral talk, no question of nuclear disarmament as declared in the Lahore Declaration but only one issue is left and that is Kashmir.

How do we go about Pakistan internationalising the Kashmir issue? I put this particular question to our hon. Minister of External Affairs the other day, 'If these talks fail and such other future summits that we hold without preparation fail, would it not lead to a third party intervention?' Of course, the hon. Minister said that there was no question about it. But is it enough to say that there was no question of internationalising the Kashmir issue. Since 1973, Pakistan has been pursuing this issue in the United Nations. Year after year, they have continued to give notices to the United Nations' Security Council to retain Kashmir on the agenda.

I had the good opportunity of being in the Government of India for almost 20 years. I have not only attended but also led many Indian delegations to international conferences. Whether it is UNO, ILO, UNIDO, ESCAP or Commonwealth, I have not come across a single occasion when Pakistan has not raised the Kashmir issue in an international forum. Whether it is relevant or not, they would always raise this issue.

SHRI VAIKO (SIVAKASI): What have they achieved?

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : What have we achieved?

SHRI VAIKO : I asked, 'What have they achieved?'

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA : But what have we achieved?

SHRI VAIKO : You were telling us that they are internationalising the Kashmir issue. Are they succeeding in that?

SHRI PURNO A. SANGMA: I do not want to argue with you. I am only questioning the Government.

Please do not take things easily. Mr. Musharraf is not a person to be dealt with in an easy way. He is a different type of person. He has been described in one of the newspapers or magazines that I have read as 'a merciless cowboy'. I do not know about it but it is true. He is a merciless cowboy and here is a thorough perfect gentleman, so sincere a man. How does it match between Mr. Musharraf's cowboy style and the perfect gentleness of the Prime Minister of India? I really do not know how it is going to be.

I think, if Pakistan is very clear on its bottomline and if Pakistan says that the LOC is the problem but not a solution,

we should be very clear about our bottomline too.

That is everything that I want to say. What is our bottomline? Our bottomline is the 1994 Resolution passed by this august House. What is that Resolution? Let me remind the House. We resolved in this House on 22nd February, 1994 that "The State of Jammu and Kashmir has been, is and shall be an integral part of India â€¦. Pakistan should vacate the area of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir which they have been occupying through aggression". This is our bottomline. We must stick to it and we have stuck to it, because this is a unanimous Resolution passed by this Parliament. This is not the decision of the Government of India alone. This is the bottomline which has been set by the House unanimously.

So, that is our bottomline. I think we have to proceed with that. Ours is a big country. I would like to remind one thing of 1965. In 1965 when Pakistan crossed over to Kashmir, the then Prime Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri authorised the Indian Army to cross the international border in Punjab. He said that he was doing it on the basis of an observation of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in 1950 "that an attack on Jammu and Kashmir would be treated as an attack against India, of which it is an integral part."

Mr. Prime Minister, you should not be so humble. You should assert yourself. You are a Prime Minister of one billion people. We are a country of Kautilya who had given us a treatise of statecraft *The Arthashastra.* Let us try to refresh our minds with the lessons that he had given. Let us not be politically naïve. Let us not be carried away by the '*Bhai Bhai'* sentimentalism. Let us not commit any profanity on the souls of 800 of our Kargil martyrs. I liked one statement of the hon. Prime Minister − this is the only statement that I liked − in which he said : 'I focussed on the terrorism being promoted in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. I conveyed in clear terms that India has the resolve, strength and stamina to counter terrorism and violence until it is decisively thrust.'

I want to reiterate this determination today on the floor of this House. That is what the Prime Minister should speak and continue to speak so.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Thank you very much.

Shri Omar Abdullah to speak now. He is not here. Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar to speak.

श्री अली मोहम्मद नायक (अनंतनाग) : चेयरमैन साहिबा, मैं जम्मू कश्मीर से ताल्लुक रखता हूं। जो लोग कांग्रेस पार्टी की तरफ से बोले हैं, बाकी पार्टी के सदस्य बोले हैं...

सभापति महोदय : कश्मीर पर श्री उमर अब्दुल्ला बोल रहे हैं।

श्री अली मोहम्मद नायक : वे तो मिनिस्टर हैं, मैं मिनिस्ट्री के बगैर खड़ा हूं तो मुझे बोलने दें।

SHRI VAIKO : Madam, please allow me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : All your names are here. I am calling as they are put by the hon. Speaker.

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar to speak now.

श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर (मइलादुतुरई) : सभापति महोदय, शायद ही इस सदन में यहां कोई और होगा जो पाकिस्तान बनने के पश्चात् इतने साल पाकिस्तान में रहा हो, जितना मैं रहा हूं, और शायद ही इस सदन में कोई और होगा जिसने हिन्दुस्तान लौटने के पश्चात् इतनी मर्तबा पाकिस्तान का दौरा किया हो जितना कि मैंने किया। शायद ही और कोई इस सदन में हो जो कि पाकिस्तान के तकरीबन हर इलाके में चाहे वह मरी हो, लाहौर हो, स्वात हो, अटक हो, पेशावर हो, या रावलपिन्डी गया हो।

SHRI VAIKO *: Please speak in English.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Please wait. Let me continue in Hindi and after four or five sentences, I will continue in English.**

MR. CHAIRMAN : You should not speak in Tamil without interpretation.

श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर : मैं कह रहा था कि शायद ही कोई हो जो लरकाना गया हो, सहवान गया हो, शिकारपुर गया हो, खैरपुर गया हो, मीरपुर खास गया हो, हैदराबाद गया हो, उमरकोट गया हो, ठट्टा गया हो, हबचौक गया हो। कराची में मैं स्वयं रहा था। चूंकि मैं थोड़ा बहुत पाकिस्तान के बारे में जानता हूं, इसलिए मैं न केवल कांग्रेस पार्टी के दूसरे वक्ता के रूप में यहां बोल रहा हूं, बल्कि एक विशेाज्ञ के रूप में भी बोल रहा हूं। इसलिए मैं आपसे इजाजत चाहता हूं कि मुझे यहां अपनी बैंत रखने के लिए कुछ समय दिया जाए।

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has to be within the time allotted.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Madam, we will do our best.

*â€¦â€¦.** English translation of sentences originally spoken in Tamil.

Madam, the country just does not know what the Government wanted out of the Agra Summit. Were they working for success or were they working for failure? Last Tuesday when this debate started, I was amazed at the pride taken by the opening speaker of the BJP, Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, who as usual, and as is the practice with BJP speakers, is not here after completing his speech. I was amazed at the pride that he took in congratulating Atalji on sending President Musharraf back to Pakistan "empty-handed". Now, I am astonished even more to discover that this is not just Dr. Vijay Kumar Malhotra's personal view that we should take pride in sending back President Musharraf empty-handed, but that it appears to be the BJP's party line. The contrast is what I wish to bring to the attention of this House.

Madam, here in this House, on the 24th of July, the Prime Minister said and I quote from paragraph 13 of his statement.

> "We are not looking for propaganda advantage or seeking to score debating points. "

He said, "We will engage in quiet, serious diplomacy." It is a very mature comment. I welcome it. But suddenly, the following Sunday, the 29th July, five days later, at the BJP's National Executive Meeting, the tune changes. Our measured and responsible NDA Prime Minister lobotomises into his true BJP self. I have here a report of that meeting taken from *The Indian Express*, a piece written by Ms. Arati Jerath and Shri Pradeep Kaushal. I wish to read from it. The *Sangh* had reason to. "You did not see Musharraf's face when he was leaving. I did.", Vajpayee said. मुंह लटकाये हुए थे। Vajpayeeji said, "He did not want to leave because he was returning empty handed. If I had asked him to stay, he would have. I didn't. I didn't even give him a photo opportunity. I realised the discussions would not succeed. He was speaking like an Army man and talks with him would not yield anything." He said that it was obvious that Musharraf had no intention of honouring the Simla and Lahore Agreements. "There was no way he could be expected to stick to anything signed in Agra" Vajpayeeji said. Madam, as far as I know, this report has not been refuted.

Madam, what I want to ask, through you, the Prime Minister is this. Did President Musharraf say anything in Agra that he had not said again and again, not just when he took over in October, 1999 but repeatedly? On the eve of coming here, he went on saying what he was going to say in Agra. We knew what he was going to say and yet, how was the Prime Minister's office reacting to the statements that were coming out of Islamabad after the Prime Minister had the grace to invite the Pakistani President?

Madam, I have before me, taken from this very subversive document `Indo-Pak Relations : Agra Summit' presented to us by the Parliament Library, a reproduction of an article by the Editor of *The Times of India*. Now, it is that Editor himself who has described the position of the Editor of *The Times of India* as the second most important position in the country after the Prime Minister.

It was written by Shri Dileep Padgaonkar himself, and it is absolutely evident that this was written on the 29th of June, 2001 on the basis of a briefing, a very top-level briefing, a very exclusive briefing given to the paper, a premier newspaper, the *Times of India*, by the Prime Minister's Office. It says here:

> "At their Summit Meeting in mid July, Prime Minister Vajpayee intends to make 'common cause' with

> President Pervez Musharraf to address the entire gamut of issues with 'a new vision and a strong sense of realism'."

This is how they were assessing it at the time when we had been listening to President Musharraf repeatedly saying that all he was interested in talking about was his core issue of Jammu and Kashmir. According to these sources, this is straight out of the PMO, "Vajpayee is eager to learn more from Musharraf". The sources said that Vajpayee had been impressed with Musharraf after their telephonic conversations. "He has repeatedly spoken about", this is the Prime Minister being quoted, "the General's sincerity, frankness, warmth, and straightforwardness". "The most important thing for the Prime Minister right now", the sources stressed, "is to put over 50 years of hostility, suspicion, and mistrust behind us". The sources added, "Vajpayee believes that this appears to be General Musharraf's agenda as well".

I just cannot get over the staggering naivety of this. If, in fact, these sources had not told the editor of a premier Indian newspaper, the *Times of India*, exactly what was reported, I would have expected the Prime Minister's Office or the Foreign Office Spokesman to have denied the validity of what was stated in this report of the 29th of June. But far from doing it, it was repeatedly made clear to the media right across the spectrum that all this hoop-la is justified because President Musharraf and Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee are really brothers under the skin.

> The Prime Minister says now that he has sent back President Musharraf long-faced and empty-handed. Is that why he invited President Musharraf here? Did he invite him to send him back long-faced? Did he invite him to send him back empty-handed? Did he invite him so that he could insult him after coming here? What was the purpose of inviting him? That is the question which, I believe, the Prime Minister has to answer when he speaks. What did he believe he was going to achieve? What was the Prime Minister aiming at? Was he aiming at failure and pride in that failure, or was he aiming at success and hope for the sub-continent through that success? If he was aiming at success, I think, the Prime Minister should, in all honesty, tell this country that he failed, that it is he who is empty-handed, and that it is he who is long-faced. Is it, in fact, a machiavellian or Chanakyan technique? Our Chanakya, Shri P.A. Sangma, has left the room; he just quoted him with great pride.
>
> Is it a Machiavellian technique, calling the President of Pakistan in order to send him back empty-handed? If so, I think, this House is entitled to know, in all honesty, that the Prime Minister's strategy was to engineer a failure of the Summit. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot have the failure of a Summit projected as the success of the Prime Minister. Madam, as a citizen of this great country, I feel utterly humiliated at what we have had to endure. If the Government feels proud about its performance, then, I am afraid, further diplomatic disasters are in store for us.

Madam, I wish to turn to another problem. Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra speaking as the first spokesman of the BJP in this debate quoted a statement made by Shri Pranab Mukherjee on the 23rd of November, 2000 in the other House. Although, Madam, according to your own Rules and Kaul and Shakdar it is only policy statements made by Ministers in the other House that could be quoted in this House, yet the Chair indulged Shri V.K.Malhotra and allowed him to quote what he wished from Shri Pranab Mukherjee's statement. I do not wish to deny a single word of what was quoted and I do not wish to say that it was quoted out of context. I accept that every word quoted was quoted correctly. I have that entire statement before me. There is no need for me to repeat the quotations by Shri V.K.Malhotra. It is quite clear that Shri V.K.Malhotra quoted with apparent pride that he had succeeded in nobbling the Congress, by saying what Shri Pranab Mukherjee said there. In my draft I had written Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra, but now it seems that I have to change it to saying the Government of India that they cannot distinguish between pre-conditions for a dialogue and conditions for a conclusion.

What Shri Pranab Mukherjee was saying was that we shall have to live with Pakistan and if we have to live with Pakistan, we must live in peace. There is no way we can tackle the problem with Pakistan except in engaging in a serious dialogue." Does this contradict what he was trying to say that you have placed all these unrealistic conditions? How was the Government of India going to change the nature of the Government of Pakistan? Neither had you brought about the *coup* nor are you capable of ending that military *coup*. How could you end cross-border terrorism -- by falling on your knees and praying? How could you stop them from indulging in hostile propaganda? These are part and parcel of the ground realities in Pakistan. That is the country with which we have to deal. What Shri Pranab Mukherjee was stating in the other House was, `do not please set these pre-conditions for a dialogue'. It is at the end of a successful dialogue that we will achieve cessation of hostile propaganda; it is at the end of a successful dialogue that we will stop cross-border terrorism; it is at the end of a successful dialogue that perhaps Pakistan will acquire its right to be a democracy. He was distinguishing between pre-conditions for a dialogue and conditions for a conclusion and the Government, it would appear from Shri Vijay Kumar Malhotra's statement, is unable to understand the distinction between these two.

Madam, also, I am amazed that it is unable to understand the distinction between dialogue and summitry. Dialogue

requires preparation. Summits require even more preparation. The Former Prime Minister, Shri Chandra Sekhar was kind enough to refer to my long experience of Summits. I have seen with my own eyes the way in which the late Rajiv Gandhi prepared for four long years for the Summit with the late Deng Xiaoping. At Summits you do not have to sit and have long detailed discussions about the wording of drafts. All that happened at Beijing was that the late Deng Xiaoping arrived, he grabbed the hands of the late Rajiv Gandhi and he went on shaking it in front of the whole world's television crew. That one handshake is reverberating today thirteen years later. It is reverberating in every chancellery. That is what Summits between adversaries are supposed to be about.

A dialogue, on the other hand, is structured at a series of levels in a pyramidal structure. You begin with Ambassadors and High Commissioners. You then move on to Joint Secretaries. From there you move on to sectoral Secretaries, that is, those who deal with Commerce, Industry, Visas and all those things. Then you send in Ministers or Plenipotentiaries, and then go in for the Foreign Secretary. Then, go in for the Foreign Ministers, and then, at the peak of the pyramid, do you get to the Summit. You need *sherpas* to get to the Summit. Even if you are Sir Edmund Hillary, you need a Tenzing to take you up to the Summit. Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, you have made a grave mistake by deciding that you will climb Mount Everest but nobody will go with you. That is the grave failure from which we have suffered again and again and again in the three years that you have been Prime Minister.

Madam, What is more, with regard to Pakistan, is that a dialogue has already been structured. It was structured when Shri Salman Haidar, the former Foreign Secretary went to Islamabad in June, 1997 and had set up a system whereby we would be talking with Pakistan.

The priority the Prime Minister should have given, on becoming the Prime Minister, was to rectifying the flaws in Shri Gujral's architecture. There were many flaws in that. Instead of rectifying the flaws in that structure, he plunged himself into the summit. He plunged twice. He plunged from the top of a mountain and he was bound to fall and break his knees.

Summits have got two purposes in diplomacy. One is to commence a process, the other is to conclude a process. If you have a summit, which neither commences a process nor concludes a process, it ends up disrupting the process. Twice in two years we have disrupted the process through these summits.

Contrast, Madam, how the Lahore and Agra summits were prepared with the preparations which President Clinton made for his summit with the Prime Minister. That was not a summit between adversaries. The United States of America and we are friends. But, because President Clinton was scheduling a summit with the Indian Prime Minister on Indian soil for the first time in 22 years, they first conducted ten rounds of negotiation between Shri Jaswant Singh and Mr. Strobe Talbott. It was only after the Americans guaged this Government out fully, after they had decided in their own minds what the position of the Government of India was with regard to every single matter, however small a matter, which was of concern to the United States of America that they said, 'Right, for the first time in 22 years President Clinton will come here.' What happened when he came here? He had dinner at the Bukhara - we have got a world famous restaurant as a consequence − and there was this beautiful ceremony in Rajasthan, and then he went home. That is what summits are for. They are not for sitting and negotiating between a Prime Minister and a President whether a 'but' should be cut out or an 'or' should be changed or not. That is a job done at a much lower level. What President Clinton did by getting Mr. Strobe Talbott to talk ten times round with Shri Jaswant Singh is called professionalism. What you have done is rank amateurishness. The confusion at Agra reflected the confusion at Lahore. There was no appreciation, no assessment, no apprehension of the threat from Pakistan when the last summit was scheduled in Lahore. Madam, I have brought with me - I have already given the authenticated version to the Secretariat and sought that it be placed on the Table of the House − excerpts from the book '*The Guilty Men of 1962*' by D.R. Mankekar. It is the edition that was published not when it was first published which was a long time ago, but the edition that was published in 1999 by Penguin Books. The difference between the original edition and this is that this edition has a Foreword by one Shri George Fernandes who, at the time when he wrote this foreword, was the Raksha Mantri of the Government of India, he was the Minister of Defence of the Government of India. I need to read to this House just one sentence from this two-page Foreword. It is a Foreword which is datelined - New Delhi, 17th December, 1998. He had been the Defence Minister of India at that stage for the better part of nine months. The Prime Minister was scheduling his visit to Lahore two months later. We also know what was happening at Kargil, what was happening on the India-Pakistan frontier and what the Defence Minister knows. This Defence Minister of India is now not a nobody. He is today the Convenor of the NDA and, therefore, in effect the leader of the NDA. He says and I quote, "The well - fostered myth that the danger to India's security comes from Pakistan has been exploded." In December, 1998, the Raksha Mantri of India, with careful thought writing a foreword for publication in a book that deals with India's most humiliating military disaster, describes the threat from Pakistan as a "myth"!

18.00 hrs.

He says that 'it is a well fostered myth.' He says that 'now, in December, 1998, that "myth has been exploded."

Now, if the Defence Minister of India, of the Prime Minister's Government believes that in December, 1998, that there was no threat from Paskistan, then how can the Indian military forces be ready to face that threat? It is blindness of this kind -- this deliberate blindness, this refusal to open the eyes, the sin of *Dhritrashtra* which was not that he was born blind but he could not distinguish between the *Pandavas* and the *Kaurvas* -- it is that kind of blindness which, I find, dealt with in detail in the Kargil Review Report, from Chapter III of , which our friend, Shri P.A. Sangma quoted. I also wish to quote from that, but not continuously.

We will have a debate on the Kargil Review Committee. We will come to the details then. I just want to read a few sentences picked up from this. The first 15 pages of it indicate what was the situation on the Kargil front when the Defence Minister of India, Shri George Fernandes, was saying that the threat from Pakistan is a myth. It says:

> "The developments of 1998 as reported in various intelligence inputs were indicative of a high level of militant activity. Reconnaisance platoons crossed the line of control in the Kargil sector in late January-early February.(that is, before he left for Lahore). They were equipped for extreme cold and snow conditions, equipment that could only have been procured from Europe and which must have been in the know of the Indian Defence Attaches posted in Europe. "

"There were many bits and pieces of information", says the Kargil Review Committee Report, "about the activity within the FCNA area (that is, forces in the northern area of Pak Occupied Kashmir) including: marked increase in cross LoC shellings in 1998, ammunition dumping amounting to one lakh kilograms by yaks, ponies and vehicles". The Review Committee says that "RAW predicted a limited swift offensive threat". It says that the Indian Commander, Commander 121 Infantry Brigade , " formulated an enhanced assessment of the threat in the Kargil sector" and finally it says --this is not me, this is K. Subrahmanyam and his colleagues -- that 'the balance of probability suggests that Nawaz Sharief was fully in the picture and was, at least, aware of the broad thrust of the Kargil plan, when he so warmly received the Indian Prime Minister in Lahore.'

And yet, the Prime Minister went! Has he learnt the lessons of Lahore? One can make a mistake. Many Prime Ministers make mistakes but they learn from these mistakes. Has the Government shown that it has learnt the lessons from Lahore?

Madam, the Prime Minister invited President Musharraf to a Summit with no prior preparations. The External Affairs Minister is on record that he tried to send a team to Pakistan but Pakistan said 'no'. Then why not call off the Summit? Why permit a Summit with no prior preparations?

Let us now come to Jammu and Kashmir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Madam, I am just concluding. This is towards the end. But you will admit that I am being relevant.

Let us come to Jammu and Kashmir. We are very much offended that President Musharraf calls it a "dispute". We object to it . We disagree. I congratulate the Government of India on objecting, on disagreeing and on insisting that Kashmir is not a dispute, that the only issue in Kashmir is the vacation of aggression in Jammu and Kashmir.

Madam, President Clinton at the invitation of Prime Minister Vajpayee came to the Central Hall of Parliament. There was another portion of his speech which the hon. Shri Chandrashekhar referred to. Mr. Clinton came to Central Hall and he described Jammu and Kashmir as a "dispute". Did the Prime Minister object to it? Did the External Affairs Minister, respectfully disagree?

1805 hours (Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav *in the Chair)*

I have with me, the text of President Clinton's address in Central Hall. I draw your attention to page 9 of it.

Clinton said, ".. to mediate the dispute over Kashmir." He is our honoured guest. He comes to Central Hall, the most sacred part of this Parliament and refers to Jammu & Kashmir as a dispute. After ten rounds of talks with Shri Jaswant Singh − I presume that Shri Jaswant Singh told them that we do not regard any issue relating to Jammu & Kashmir as a dispute − the President has the gall to come to our Central Hall and described it as a dispute. And nobody, as far as I know, in the Government of India has lodged a protest with the US Government for having called it a dispute.

The Prime Minister himself went to Washington for his return Summit meeting. Officials of the Ministry of External Affairs stated that Jammu & Kashmir was not on the agenda of the Prime Minister's talks with President Clinton; and yet in the Oval Office of the White House, President Clinton forced Jammu & Kashmir on to the agenda. Did that not signal President Musharraf that he only had to get India into a room and then India would bend at the knees?

I congratulate the Government of India; I do not know how far they are responsible for it. But I think, we can congratulate ourselves. It is because the United Nations Secretary-General has stated that the UN Resolutions of the `40s, `50s and the `60s are not self-enforcing. It is a good thing that we succeeded in getting at least that. But did the External Affairs Minister ask the UN Secretary-General, when he came to India, whether this statement of his − not being self-enforcing and therefore, there is nothing that we can do about it − applied or did not apply to two documents that came into existence in international diplomacy after Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee became the Prime Minister in March 1998? The first was the statement of the G-8 in Geneva where they demanded that we should "resume, without delay, a direct dialogue that addresses the root causes of the tensions, including Kashmir". Does the Government of India accept that the root cause of tension between India and Pakistan is Jammu & Kashmir? Did the Government of India at least go to the G-8 Foreign Ministers and say that there is no such place as Kashmir, that there is only a place called Jammu & Kashmir and that if they talk about Kashmir, they are only talking about a Valley? There is a place called Jammu; there is also Ladakh; there are also the Northern Areas. So, they must call it as the State of Jammu & Kashmir. The Government of India has not objected either to their referring to Kashmir.

Since 1973, the Pakistanis also have said, "â€¦ the Question of Jammu & Kashmir." It was on the UN agenda. But in this G-8 Resolution, it only refers to Kashmir. Is this because you have in mind the trifurcation on communal lines of the State of Jammu & Kashmir? If it is not so, then why do you permit this to stand on the record in international arenas, three years after it was passed? But this is not the worst of it. The G-8 Resolution is only a G-8 Resolution.

But the awful thing is this. The sword of Damocles' that is hanging over the head of this Government and over the nation is this. For the first time after 1965, or for the first time in 33 years, the UN Security Council passed a Resolution on the 6th June 1998 in which it first endorsed the Joint Communiqué issued by the G-8, which is now a Security Council document because the number is given; then it says: "â€¦ urges India and Pakistan to resume the dialogue in order to remove the tensions between them and find mutually acceptable solutions that address the root causes of these tensions, including Kashmir."

Is it the root cause of the tensions? This is what the G-8 says under the leadership of President Clinton, under the leadership of Strobe Talbott, under the leadership of the lady who has just visited us over here and under the leadership of Condelezza Rice who took Shri Jaswant Singh into the Oval Office. Have we in ten rounds of discussion told the Americans or told the G-8 that if they refer to Jammu & Kashmir as Kashmir and describe it as a root cause of tensions between the two countries, it is unacceptable to us? During the times of that great man, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and his great foreign office aid Shri Krishna Menon, they used to tell them we used to tell the Americans without fear that this is our position and we are not going to let you dominate over us. Have we become crippled? Have we signalled not only the world, but through the world have we signalled Pakistan that we are impotent? And is that why Musharraf is retreating from the bilateralism of Simla into creeping multilateralism and third party intervention?

What is the point in the Prime Minister's statement now saying, I saw it was quoted by one of my previous speakers with some appreciation, "I focused on terrorism and he focused on Jammu and Kashmir"? Did he not know that Musharraf would focus on Jammu and Kashmir? The statement given in the House talks about the efforts at the summit level to "bridge the gap". Are summits the place for such verbal pyrotechnics? There was a brilliant formulation done by one of your predecessors, whom I know you are a great admirer of, that is, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao. In 1993, he found a formulation to bridge the gap. In his letter to Benazir Bhutto, which I now know from Mani Dixit's autobiography of his days in South Block, was drafted not by the Foreign Office but by the Prime Minister, he put it down as, we are ready (he told Benazir Bhutto) to discuss "issues related to Jammu and Kashmir". If you use that formula for bridging it, they can take up whatever they want as an issue related to Jammu and Kashmir, you can take up all that concerns us as an issue related to Jammu and Kashmir, you just have an agenda item which says "Issues related to Jammu and Kashmir". You can get on with the job.

But instead of that you are insisting on abandoning the past. In your musings from Kerala, you said that you are taking "a new road". The EAM says that this is "the high road to peace". What do these words mean? What specifically are you relinquishing? What are you retaining? What is your bottom - line? No one knows, not even your party colleagues and not even the Council of Ministers know. The White House does not know. General Musharraf does not know. Is this the Government's way of running foreign policy?

> I would say, please go to Pakistan but only after due preparations, only after structuring and conducting a sustained dialogue, a dialogue which is uninterrupted and uninterruptable. You have the example of the talks at Hotel Majestic every Thursday between Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho or their representatives at the Hotel Majestic in Paris. I was posted in Hanoi at that time. So, I actually watched the structuring of this dialogue. During those four years from 1968 November, when the talks started, till the conclusion of the agreement in 1973, the Americans dropped more bombs on North Vietnam than the whole world had dropped on itself through the whole of the Second World War and yet every Thursday they talked. They

talked from positions which were much harder than the Indian and Pakistani positions today. When you begin a dialogue you must state your maximum position and you must stick to it. And, then as the dialogue proceeds, let it proceed only through a single politically - empowered interlocutor. The dialogue must be composite and not fractured and it must be inured from the inevitable ups and downs of this difficult relationship. It is only after such a dialogue reaches the point of conclusion that there should be another summit with Pakistan scheduled.

Please be patient. Please do not be in a hurry. Please seek the cooperation of people like myself who have spent 20 years completely immersed in India-Pakistan relations. Please take my help as we took Jaswantji's help. Jaswantji and I were together in a small working group that worked with the Pakistanis. We went to Singapore together. We went to Stockholm together. In Stockholm we insisted that the Indians and Pakistanis must talk on the sub-continent. They asked us to get the visas. I promised them visas and he gave the place. We went to Udaipur. We actually got a secret solution which was handed over by Jaswantji and me personally to the Foreign Secretary in the South Block about how to sort out the question of security relating to gas supplies from Iran to India through an overl and pipeline that goes through Pakistan. We worked together.

Whatever our differences are, and they are very many − Shri Jaswant Singh would tell you what those differences are − we worked together. But when it came to issues like Pakistan and China, when it came to South Asia, when it came to relations with the United States of America, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had created an atmosphere in which there was no Opposition and there was no Government. We were together and we worked together. In the last three years, Mr. Prime Minister, I hold you and your Government responsible for wrecking that national consensus. I plead with you in the interest of a billion and a quarter people, their peace, their prosperity and their progress, that you must restore a system in which people like me and people like Shri Shivraj Patil, Shrimati Girija Vyas whose State is just next to Pakistan, and people like Shrimati Margaret Alva who has some understanding of where the Muslims first came to India, I want that all of us be involved. If the Prime Minister promises that he will take first the nation together, there is no Pakistani who can defeat us. The Pakistanis will understand that there is one India, that it is an India which has a firm mind but it is an India with a large heart. We can come to conclusion that my friend Shri Sangma despairs of our comings.

I am absolutely confident that the wonderful people of Pakistan, the really lovely people there, the hundreds and hundreds of friends that I have there, will rise to the occasion and will fulfil the vision you have for us. But do not do it on your own. You cannot be a summiteer on your own. You need sherpas and we are willing to be your sherpas.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

(SHRI OMAR ABDULLAH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am not participating in this debate as the junior Minister in the Ministry of External Affairs. I think, the position of the Government and the position of the Ministry of External Affairs and what transpired in Agra will be much better explained to the House by my senior Minister, Shri Jaswant Singh and our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. I am participating in this debate as one of the six legally elected representatives of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, unfortunately one of the legally elected representatives that the Government of Pakistan for some reason or the other refuses to recognise. They would much rather talk about the involvement of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and then involve only the All Parties Hurriyat Conference but choose to disregard the representative character that parties like the National Conference, the Congress, the BJP and other mainstream parties might have. But that is another issue altogether.

A lot has been talked about in the House in the course of this debate and in the course of the media debate that has been carried on about the failure of the Agra Summit and about how Agra Summit was supposed to produce miraculous results and has now delivered absolutely nothing and that we should hang our heads in shame because we have failed to deliver anything. But where exactly does the Agra Summit pretend to be a failure? Is it a failure because we did not conduct our Summit in the glare of the media cameras? Is it a failure because we chose not to talk in the press and decided that it would be in the best interest of the success of the Summit to confine our discussion to the closed rooms? That it would be a success or that we would put less pressure on ourselves if the Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee and the President, Gen. Musharraf conducted their dialogue at one to one level and then at delegation level and if any interaction with the media was necessary it would be done at the end of the Summit? Is that what constitute a failure? Is it our failure because there has been no joint declaration? But where does it say that a Summit is successful only if you have a joint declaration at the end? If the differences were vast

and we were unable to bridge them, the fact is that a start has been made and as a representative or as a Minister in this Government but as a person who hails from the State of Jammu and Kashmir or from the region of this country that perhaps has the most to gain by the success of Agra, we see the success of this Summit in the fact that the process has started.

The process of dialogue between India and Pakistan has begun. We hope that it is an irreversible process. We hope that the process will continue and we hope that, at whatever level, this dialogue would continue because at the end of the day, the tension between India and Pakistan, whatever else may be our differences, reflects first and foremost in the sufferings of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

So much has been talked here about the lack of an agenda as if the Government hid the fact that there was no agenda or that the lack of agenda was something which we had decided to go with. It takes two people to make an agenda. The Government of India put forward their point of view. The Government of India put forward an eight-point agenda for Pakistan to consider. The Government of India began the preparation with the confidence-building measures that were announced. These were not just confidence-building measures that were confined to one area. They were confidence-building measures that represented the length and the breadth of our composite dialogue with Pakistan. They involved people-to-people contacts, they involved security measures and they involved economic aspects of our relationship. This was the extent to which our preparations were continuing. Now, if Pakistan refuses to either receive a delegation from us to put together an agenda or refuses to send one to us, are we to call the process off? Is that what the Opposition would rather have us done?

Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar just now said that in the absence of an agenda, we should have called the dialogue off, in which case, when the Prime Minister and the Government consulted all political parties, why did the Opposition then not stand up and say, "No, you have no agenda. Please call off these talks. Do not go without an agenda." Sir, at that time, they never said anything like that. At that time, by and large, most of the Opposition Parties was standing and wishing the Prime Minister best of luck. It would have been better if at that time they had said, "You have no agenda. Please do not go." There is an English saying: "Hindsight is twenty-twenty." It is very easy now that you perceived this Summit to be a failure, that you can advocate blame as and where you like. It would have been better if you had come up with this suggestion before the Summit had actually begun.

We talked about preparation and how apparently the Government of India went into this Summit completely unprepared or the Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee was going to the Summit with his eyes closed. The extent to which this preparation went ahead, I think, is not reflected by something that I will say or something that the Government of India will say. I would like to read a small piece from a magazine called *Outlook* of 30th July wherein it says:

> " The Prime Minister had been warned about how mercurial Indo-Pak negotiations have always been. One of his Joint Secretaries recalled that after talks had broken down in Simla, Bhutto had used his farewell call to plead for some last minute concessions and Indira Gandhi had yielded. So, when Musharraf tried the same tactic, the Prime Minister was prepared. "

The Prime Minister was prepared. His preparation went to the extent of studying what and how the previous Summits had been carried out, the previous tactics that have been used by the Pakistan Government, the previous methods that have been used to try and extract concessions from the Government of India, and no amount of yielding was done.

I will come to the points on which perhaps the Opposition would like to have us yield so that we could have called this Summit a great success. They talked about preparation. Who was not involved in the process of preparation? Government of Jammu and Kashmir was involved in dialogue. The representatives of the people of Jammu and Kashmir elected to Delhi were involved in discussions. All Opposition Parties were included in the dialogue. Intellectuals have been spoken to. Media were involved in the process of preparation. As I said, confidence-building measures to bring Pakistan into preparatory dialogue for all this were taken. What else would you have us do? The fact that Pakistan harped only on the issue of J&K is no secret. The fact that that is what they were going to come and do is no secret.

Is returning to *status quo* a better option, saying that Pakistan will talk only about Jammu and Kashmir, so we will not talk? At least, we are willing to talk about Jammu and Kashmir. The Prime Minister has rightly said that when we are talking about Jammu and Kashmir, we are talking about the part of Kashmir that had been occupied by Pakistan since 1947. We are talking about the part of Jammu and Kashmir which is legally a part of India. We are talking about a part of Jammu and Kashmir that we want back. That is the part of Jammu and Kashmir that we are willing to talk about.

So much has been said about the unprofessional manner in which this Summit was conducted by the Government of India, how there was lack of preparation and how the Congress seems to have a formula worked out just right so that Summits are absolutely successful and everything moves on from there. I am no great student of history. But I

see the facts in front of me and I draw my inferences from there. The Shimla Agreement, we all agree, is one of the corner stones of relationship between India and Pakistan. But after 1971, after the signing of the Shimla Agreement, what steps did the Congress take to once and for all solve the dispute that exists? What steps did the Congress take to reclaim the area of Kashmir that has been illegally occupied by Pakistan? Exactly, what did the Congress do to ensure that relations between India and Pakistan improve to the extent where we live like good neighbours? I do not know what the Congress did. I do not know about the policies of Congress. All that I know is that by 1991 the State has slumped into the condition that we now see. So, where exactly is this masterful professionalism that you talk about? Where is this great summitry formula that you seem to have worked out? Where are the secret solutions that you have? If you have secret solutions, do you not think that the country has the right to know? We do not have any secret solutions. When the hon. Prime Minister stands up to sum up the discussion and when the senior Minister, Shri Jaswant Singh talks, he will not tell you that we have a secret solution and that we are hiding it. But if you have some secret formula to make the summits successful, please by all means share it with us because this is not a Congress-BJP issue nor is it a BJP-National Conference issue. It is not a Government-Opposition issue. This is an issue that confronts the people of this country. I think they have the right to know. At least, I would love to know. More than anybody else in this House, except the few Members of Parliament from Kashmir, I face the direct repercussion of the tension that exists between India and Pakistan because of what they are doing in Jammu and Kashmir. It is my person and my family's person who are threatened by what is happening there. It is my land where the blood is being shed. And you have the audacity to turn around and tell us that we are unprofessionals and that you do everything in the right way and we do things in the wrong way. If that is the case, for God's sake, please tell us why we are where we are today? We have just come into the Government. We have been in the Government only for three years. But how long have we been independent? We have been independent for fifty-three years. Compare fifty years with three years. What do you left with? Almost for fifty years, we had the Government of one party. Yet, you tell us that you are successful and we are failures. No purpose would be served by finger pointing. We all would like to have seen the unqualified success out of Agra. I do not understand your definition of `unqualified success'. But most importantly for us, the process has begun. The process of dialogue has begun and, I repeat, it must continue.

Now, you want the successful outcome of the Summit. A joint communiqué or a joint statement, perhaps, would have determined the successful outcome. A joint statement would have been possible if we had agreed on everything. The one crucial issue that is of utmost importance to us is the cross-border terrorism. It is the core of the problem that we are facing in Jammu and Kashmir.

Pakistan wanted to call it a freedom struggle or a *Jehad* - I will get into that in a moment. But in order to have this so-called successful summit, would you have liked us to have given an inch of land? Would you have been satisfied, if in the interest of having a Joint Statement or a Joint Declaration, we had decided to call cross-border terrorism, what it obviously is which is cross-border terrorism, or let Pakistan call it some sort of a freedom struggle, an indigenous freedom struggle? Is that what you would have preferred? If that is, allow me to quote from The Pioneer of Thursday, the July 26, 2001. This also gives an indication of how previous Summits and discussions, perhaps from a position of strength, have been carried out. And the writer says:

> "Agra was perhaps the only India-Pakistan Summit where India did not lose what it had won on the battle field. We have a history of losing on the round table. Even this time, General Pervez Musharraf nearly got away with blue murder."

Is this our lack of preparation? Is this the unprofessional or a cavalier manner in which we conducted our summits? Would you have liked us to give away our position so that we are able to speak on from strength? The fact of the matter is that there is no indigenous freedom struggle in Jammu and Kashmir. Let us be under no mistake about that aspect. Yes, there is an element of the freedom struggle in the form of misguided youth in Jammu and Kashmir, which for reasons that we all know is being taken advantage of by Pakistan. But the fact of the matter is that the situation in Jammu and Kashmir is clearly and clearly a situation of cross-border terrorism. Otherwise, explain to me please, why at last count, if my information is correct, we have had militants of 16 different nationalities who we have either caught or who have died in cross-fire. We have had Bosnians; we have had Chechenians; we have had Sudanese; and we have had people from the United Kingdom and the United States who have come over to participate in this so-called indigenous freedom struggle that is going on in Jammu and Kashmir. Would you have liked us to classify this as an indigenous freedom struggle in order to have a Joint Declaration at the end? Would you have liked that we accepted this as a *Jehad,* which is what they like to call it?

How many of us here actually know what the concept of *Jehad* is? A *Jehad*, in Islam, is fought when Islam is threatened. Now, is there anybody in this House who would tell me that Islam is more threatened here than it is in Pakistan? I come from Jammu and Kashmir. I know the level of integration of the Shia and Sunni communities. When is the last time you heard of Shia and Sunni violence in Jammu and Kashmir? How many times do I have to show you of the Shia-Sunni violence in Pakistan? Karachi just is one shining example. So, where is the question of Islam being threatened in the State of Jammu and Kashmir?

We, in India, are proud of our secular heritage. If somebody as a Christian can go to a church; somebody as a Hindu can go to a temple; nobody stops us in Kashmir from going to a mosque. We are free to carry out our religion the way we feel fit. Where then does the question of a *Jehad* arise? So, why this whole phenomenon being built up that just because we could not sign a Joint Declaration at the end the summit has failed?

We went to the Summit as well prepared as it was possible. Now, you tell us that we have a flip-flop policy on Kashmir; one moment we have a cease-fire, the next moment we do not; one moment we talk to somebody and the next moment we do not. Do I have to remind the Congress about their flip-flop policy on Kashmir? Do I have to remind you about how excellent the person Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah was until you threw him into jail? Do I have to remind you about how Farooq Abdullah was an anti-national element when you dismissed his Government in 1984? Then, how he was a pro-national element when you signed an Accord with him in 1987? Does this not indicate a flip-flop policy?

The Government of India has consistently tried to create a condition conducive for dialogue further in Kashmir. In order to create those conditions, it has tried everything possible. But you tell us that we have taken no initiative or that we only react to the situation. The cease-fire was announced but it did not yield the result that we wanted it to. Again it is no secret.

But it was our initiative. They cannot accuse us of not trying. At great personal cost − no secret with the security forces − to the National Conference party as a whole, because no other party was systematically targeted the way we were during the period of that ceasefire and to the general population, yes it was an initiative that we had to try. We had to try the ceasefire; we had to give those militants a chance to come to the table and talk. When the Hizbul Mujahideen had earlier announced a ceasefire, again it was our duty to react. Would they not have us react when the Hizbul Mujahideen announce a ceasefire and engage them in dialogue? Would they have us say that we do not want to talk to them and rather we would shoot them? Is that the sort of mature reaction that they expect from us or is that the mature reaction would they have had? No; when the Hizbul Mujahideen announced a ceasefire, we accepted their ceasefire, we decided that we would not initiate any combat operation and we would talk to them, but against the others we would continue our military operations. So, where then is the flip-flop policy? We have tried; where we have succeeded, we have succeeded, where we have failed we have admitted. At least we have the maturity and the courage of our convictions to say 'yes; we tried, but we failed'. We tried and nobody can accuse us of not trying.

Sir, Agra, by no stretch of imagination, is a failure. Yes; it did not live up to the hype that the newspapers and the media generated, but no Summit would have been able to, not a Summit conducted by the NDA Government, not a Summit that would have been conducted by the erstwhile United Front Government and not a Summit that would have been conducted under the leadership of the Congress Party, no Summit would have lived up to the expectations that the media generated for Agra. But Agra created some very convincing and useful results. It created an atmosphere for dialogue, which will continue. It created a rapport between Prime Minister Vajpayee and Gen. Musharraf that will continue. It has created a road map, which I really, with all earnestness, request this Government, of which I am a part, to carry forward.

Before I end, I would like to make one final point. So much has been said about my colleague in the Government, Shrimati Sushma Swaraj, about what she was doing in Agra, whether she was there at anybody's request and if she was, who asked her to speak. I do not know how things were during their time or during the United Front Government's time, but I know for a fact, in this Government Ministers do not turn up at Summits uninvited. It does not happen. If the Minister of Information and Broadcasting was there, she was there with a purpose. She was there to ensure that the media − and there were huge numbers of them, perhaps, more than any other event that has been managed by any Government before this − did not have any problems, that things went smoothly and they did. She was there, when necessary, to put the Government of India's point of view forward. That is what she did.

So, what did she say that was wrong? She said that these issues were discussed. I was not in Agra. I was not even in the office. I was following the Summit, almost like everybody else, using the television and I heard the statement that Shrimati Sushma Swaraj, at the spur of the moment right there and then, made that what was conveyed to her that the delegation-level talks have now started. So, what does the delegation-level talks mean? It means that aside from Kashmir, now the Government of India will be raising these issues, which is what we did.

We had always promised the people that in the Agra Summit we would not confine our dialogue to one point, because that is not the way in which relations between India and Pakistan would move forward. We said that we would talk about the comprehensive dialogue that we had structured, we would talk about the Most Favoured Nation status, which Pakistan must accord to India, we would talk about the cross-border terrorism, we would talk about the avoidance of nuclear war, we would talk about the cultural relations and we would talk about the Iran-India gas pipeline. So, what exactly is that that she said that was not music to our ears? The fact that Pakistan did not like it is not the issue. She is not the Information and Broadcasting Minister of Pakistan, last time I checked. She

is our Information and Broadcasting Minister. Her right is to tell us what we want to hear. Her job is not to tell the people across the border what they want to hear. So, let us put that to rest once and for all.

So, at the end, Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would just like to reiterate that as far as we, in the National Conference, are concerned, as far as the people of Jammu and Kashmir are concerned, it is our earnest hope that the process of dialogue between India and Pakistan continue, continue at any level the Prime Minister, in his inherent wisdom and years of experience, sees fit.

Our commitment and support to this peaceful process of ironing out and settling the areas of concern between India and Pakistan once and for all will continue. That is all we can ask for. With that, I thank you very much for this opportunity.

सभापति महोदय : यदि सदन की सहमति हो, तो समय बढ़ाया जाए क्योंकि अभी बहुत माननीय सदस्यों को बोलना है, काफी लम्बी सूची हमारे पास है और आज ही चर्चा समाप्त करनी है।

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH (ADOOR): It could be taken up tomorrow.â€¦ (*Interruptions*)

सभापति महोदय : यह आलरेडी बिजनैस एडवाइजरी कमेटी की बैठक में डिसाइड हो चुका है। यहां श्री सन्तोा गंगवार जी, पार्लियामेंट्री अफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर बैठे हैं। मैं उनसे आग्रह करूंगा कि वे अपनी बात कहें।

पेट्रोलियम और प्राकृतिक गैस मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री संतोा कुमार गंगवार) : महोदय, इस पर आज ही चर्चा समाप्त होनी है और चूंकि वक्ताओं की एक लम्बी सूची है इसलिए यदि आप सहमत हों, तो भोजन की व्यवस्था कर दी जाए। इसलिए मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूं कि जब तक वक्ताओं की सूची समाप्त न हो, तब तक सदन की अवधि को बढ़ाया जाए।

SHRI VAIKO : It was discussed even in a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee. Tomorrow, there may be another important discussion. Therefore, we have to complete it.

SHRI KODIKUNNIL SURESH : Then, it could be discussed day after tomorrow.

SHRI VAIKO : Day after tomorrow is Friday. How could we take it up on that day? ...(*Interruptions*) No, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN : It has already been decided in a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee. So, there is no problem. Now, Kumari Mayawati will speak.

कुमारी मायावती (अकबरपुर) : सभापति महोदय, नियम 193 के तहत कश्मीर मुद्दे को लेकर आगरा में हुई भारत पाकिस्तान शिखर वार्ता के तहत जो चर्चा चल रही है, मैं उस पर बोलने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूं। यह काफी महत्वपूर्ण चर्चा है और यह इश्यू हमारे देश के राट्रीय मुद्दे से जुड़ा हुआ इश्यू है। आगरा में भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच में जो भी शिखर वार्ता हुई और उसके जो नतीजे सामने आए हैं, उनके बारे में अपनी प्रतिक्रिया व्यक्त करने से पहले मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी का इस बात के लिए स्वागत करती हूं कि उन्होंने इसके लिए भारत की ओर से पहल की, क्योंकि यह जरूरत हमारी है। कश्मीर भारत का अभिन्न अंग है और कश्मीर पर पाकिस्तान की किस प्रकार से निगाहें हैं, वहां क्या सोचा जा रहा है, इसका ध्यान रखते हुए, भारत कश्मीर का अभिन्न अंग है, इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए पहल करने की जरूरत भारत की है और यह पहल जो की गई है, यह अच्छी शुरूआत है।

इस पहल का अंतर्राट्रीय स्तर पर भी एक अच्छा मैसेज गया है, खास तौर से पाकिस्तान को लेकर जो यह आम चर्चा होती थी और पाकिस्तान विदेशों या अंतर्राट्रीय स्तर पर भारत के बारे में हमेशा यह कहता था कि हम तो बातचीत करना चाहते हैं लेकिन भारत बातचीत करने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। भारत की ओर से पहल करने पर, मैं समझती हूं कि उनको आगे यह कहने का मौका नहीं मिलेगा। यह बातचीत आगे भी जारी रहनी चाहिए, हमारी पार्टी इसकी पक्षधर है। लेकिन बातचीत में किसी तीसरे की मध्यस्थता नहीं होनी चाहिए, कोई तीसरा बिचौलिया नहीं होना चाहिए, बातचीत भारत और पाकिस्तान में सीधी होनी चाहिए। शिमला समझौते और लाहौर घोाणा पत्र के तहत भारत की ओर से बातचीत होनी चाहिए, हमें इससे अलग हट कर नहीं जाना चाहिए। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि आगरा में भारत और पाकिस्तान के बीच जो शिखर वार्ता हुई, वह नाकाम क्यों हुई। इसके बारे में हमारी पार्टी का यह मानना है कि यदि वार्ता से पहले भारत की ओर से एजैंडा स्पट होता तो वह वार्ता नाकाम नहीं होती। वार्ता होने के बाद हमें इसके बारे में भी गंभीरता से सोचना होगा। माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह क्लीयर कट कहा है कि पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति ने इस वार्ता को आगे जारी रखने के लिए अपने देश में बुलाने की जो दावत दी है, उस को हमने कबूल किया है। लेकिन हमें पाकिस्तान में जाने से पहले पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति की मानसिकता को भी ध्यान में रखना होगा क्योंकि वार्ता के बाद पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति ने अपने पहले संवाददाता सम्मेलन में भारत से यह कहा कि यदि भारत के लिए कश्मीर राट्रीय सम्मान का प्रश्न है तो पाकिस्तान के लिए यह राट्रीय गौरव का सवाल है। दूसरा, पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति यह भी कहते हैं कि कश्मीर की प्रौब्लम आजादी की प्रौब्लम है। पाकिस्तान का जो नजरिया है, खास तौर से पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति का कश्मीर मामले को लेकर जो नजरिया है, उसके ऊपर माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को गंभीरता से सोच-विचार कर ही पाकिस्तान जाने का कोई फैसला लेना चाहिए। लेकिन बातचीत जारी रहनी चाहिए, हमारी पार्टी इसके पक्ष में है। जब माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी पाकिस्तान में जाने का अपना प्रोग्राम बनाते हैं तो आगरा की तरह नहीं होना चाहिए, जैसे आगरा में भारत-पाकिस्तान की जो शिखर वार्ता हुई तो भारत की ओर से एजैंडा क्लीयर नहीं था।

उसका फायदा पाकिस्तान ने उठाया, लेकिन अगर दोबारा वार्ता होती है तो माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को वार्ता करने से पहले अपना एजेण्डा स्पट करना चाहिए और जाने से पहले पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति के पास भी भेज देना चाहिए कि यह एजेण्डा है, यदि आप इस एजेण्डे पर वार्ता करने के लिए तैयार हैं, तभी मैं पाकिस्तान आने के लिए तैयार हूं, यह बिल्कुल स्पट होना चाहिए। मैं समझती हूं कि जब यह बिल्कुल स्पट हो जायेगा, क्योंकि उससे पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति की मेंटेलिटी भी साफ जाहिर हो जायेगी, जब भारत की ओर से एजेण्डा चला जायेगा कि एजेण्डे में ये-ये इश्यूज हैं और इनके ऊपर वार्ता होगी। यदि पाकिस्तान सही मायने में चाहता है कि प्राब्लम हल होनी चाहिए और भारत और पाकिस्तान के सम्बन्ध अच्छे होने चाहिए तो मैं समझती हूं कि एजेण्डे को देखकर वह अपनी स्वीकृति दे देगा और यदि पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति भारत के एजेण्डे से सहमत नहीं होते हैं तो मैं यह समझती हूं कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी को फिर पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति से वार्ता नहीं करनी चाहिए, क्योंकि यदि हमने उनके वर्बली कहने के ऊपर प्रोग्राम बना लिया तो यह उचित नहीं होगा। यह प्रोग्राम लिखित में होना चाहिए और एजेण्डा बिल्कुल क्लियर

होना चाहिए। आगरा में कश्मीर को लेकर भारत पाकिस्तान के बीच जो शिखर वार्ता हुई, उसमें सरकार को सफलता नहीं मिली है, इससे सबक सीखकर जब दोबारा वार्ता करनी है तो हमारी सरकार का एजेण्डा बिल्कुल क्लियर होना चाहिए।

माननीय सभापति जी, जो बातें मैंने आपके माध्यम से सरकार के जिम्मेदार मंत्री के सामने यहां रखी है, उस पर गौर करके आगे का प्रोग्राम आप बनाएंगे तो उससे पाकिस्तान के साथ जो सम्बन्ध बिगड़ रहे हैं, किन इश्यूज को लेकर बिगड़ रहे हैं और किन इश्यूज पर वार्ता करनी है तो मैं समझती हूं एजेण्डा स्पट करके हमें आगे पहल करनी चाहिए। धन्यवाद।

SHRI VAIKO : Mr. Chairman, Sir, a very significant discussion is taking place about the Summit which took place under the shadow of one of the wonders of the world, the everlasting monument built by emperor Shahajahan at the banks of Yamuna. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR (AKOLA): Had it been in South, it would have been better. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAIKO : Let us hope next time.

Not only the initiator of this debate, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav but also my esteemed colleague, Shri Somnath Chatterjee repeatedly asked the question, for what reasons and why the Prime Minister of India extended the invitation, wrote a letter inviting Gen. Pervez Musharraf to India for a Summit talk. That was their moot question. It is because of the foresight of our Prime Minister; it is because of the sagacity of our Prime Minister; it is because of his perspective approach to the problem; and it is because of well-calculated move towards this. He addressed the entire gamut of issues between India and Pakistan. He expressed in crystal clear terms, he expressed his wisdom and foresight in his Kumaragam musings, I quote:-

> "In our search for lasting solution to the Kashmir problem, both in its external and internal dimensions, we shall not traverse solely on the beaten track of the past. Rather we shall be bold and innovative designers of a future architecture of peace and prosperity of the entire South Asian Region. "

Therefore, he intended to make a common cause with Pervez Musharraf, and address the entire gamut of issues derailing India-Pakistan relations including, obviously, Jammu and Kashmir, combating cross-border terrorism, building harmonious brotherhood with a new vision and a strong sense of realism. It is a right step at the right moment in right earnestness. I commend the steps taken by our Prime Minister.

Therefore, when he made the statement here on 24th July, it was very clear for what purpose the letter of invitation was sent. He stated here and I quote:

> "Building on the Simla Agreement and the Lahore Declaration, we sought, through the invitation and the consequent visit, to strengthen the broad-based framework of dialogue, so that progress could be made on all outstanding bilateral issues, including Jammu & Kashmir. We also identified the continuing cross-border terrorism as an important subject to be addressed.
>
> We made proposals for addressing the issues of peace and security − including nuclear and conventional CBM's, Jammu & Kashmir, and terrorism; and all other issues from the composite dialogue."

When they raised the question about the motive and intention, the Deputy Leader of the Congress Parliamentary Party, Shri Madhavrao Scindia exhibited his expertise in formulating epithets with a powerful language like Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, who is also another expert in that, but they lacked substance in their articulations. It is because their main charge was that there was no structural agenda and there was no preparation. What was the agenda? It is very clear that the agenda was on the basis of Simla Agreement. The agenda was on the basis of Lahore Declaration. The agenda was to continue the process of dialogue. Of course, our Foreign Ministry as a precautionary measure addressed the issue and said that there should be an agenda. I would say that they sent eight points for the agenda but General Pervez Musharraf said, 'No, whatever it is, we are not prepared for any agenda at present.' We have invited him. Our Indian Government was preparing itself to send a delegation there but he was not prepared for that at that point of time.

I would put a pertinent question to my friends from the Opposition. The meeting of all-Party leaders took place here in Delhi. In that particular meeting, all the leaders of political parties participated, particularly, the Opposition leaders. I would ask them a question. Did they take up this issue? Did they get this point clarified? Did they object to the point that there was no agenda in their view? If there is no agenda, you have to scuttle the talk. That is the

point. Did they suggest that if there was no agenda, there should not be any summit?

19.00 hrs.

Did you say that on that day? In a democracy, you can express your views. But nobody objected to the fact that there was no structural agenda. I particularly ask this question to my Congress friends. Shri Madhavrao Scindia is not here but Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar and others are here. Did you suggest that if there was no agenda there should be no Summit? Did you object to that? You did not object that day. But today you are coming here to Parliament and on issue after issue trying to corner the Government. Every time, you have miserably failed and this time also you have miserably failed.

I would like to raise a question here. You speak about the previous declarations. Did you convene a meeting of all the parties before the Simla Summit? Did your Government convene a meeting of all parties and take them into confidence? ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ALI MOHD. NAIK : When the hon. Prime Minister called a meeting of the allies and the Opposition, he put it before the house that we had written to Pakistan on an eight-point agenda but they were not agreeing to it. But none of the representatives of the allies or the Opposition said, 'You should call off this Summit.' They said, 'You should go on.' ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VAIKO : That is why, out of frustration and despair, they are searching to raise issue after issue and every time they have failed. They cannot answer this question. Did they convene, when the Congress was in power, before the Simla Summit, a meeting of all parties? Did they take into confidence the leaders of the political parties? No. Such a meeting never took place. Before the Tashkent Summit, did they take the leaders of political parties into confidence or did they take the opinion of those leaders? That was not their custom because they were under the impression that for years together they would only be sitting in the Treasury Benches; they never anticipated that they would have to sit in the Opposition Benches also. Therefore, they should not now come and say, 'Oh! These are the issues on which you have not taken us into confidence.'

My friends, particularly from the Congress Benches, referred to the Lahore trip. Shri Somnath Chatterjee also criticised the Government and asked, 'Why did you go to Lahore?' They conveniently forget another defining moment in the history of India. That was the Pokharan explosion. It was only after the Pokharan explosion that our hon. Prime Minister took the correct step of going to Lahore, extending an olive branch for talks and dialogue. The result was that when we met in Kargil, the whole world stood by us; not even a single Islamic country supported Pakistan for the first time in the history of India. It did not happen when they were in power; when Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee was sitting in the throne, not even a single Islamic country supported Pakistan. It was because of the Lahore trip. India met Pakistan at Lahore; India met Pakistan in Kargil. It is up to Pakistan to decide which of the meetings suited their interests. This was stated by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. It was because of the Lahore trip that we got international support in Kargil.

This time, when Mr. Pervez Musharraf came here, the very same General who was advocating *jehad* had to admit and acknowledge the fact at the banquet hosted by the President of India that there could not be any military solution. Whether he spoke from his heart or not is a different matter but he had to acknowledge this fact in the precincts of the Rashtrapati Bhawan, when the banquet was hosted. In his speech, he had to acknowledge this fact. Therefore, Dr. Raffaq Hussain, a distinguished academician and Head of the Department of Strategic Studies at the Qaid-e-Azam University stated: 'Never in the history of the two countries had India extended an invitation to a Pakistani Head of State in normal circumstances for a dialogue to discuss all outstanding issues including the contentious Kashmir dispute.'

When there was a news that the very same General repudiated both the Simla Agreement and the Lahore Declaration, it was our Foreign Minister who took up the issue with the Government of Pakistan and immediately Shri Imanul Haq had to issue a denial and he had to make a statement that Mr. Pervez Musharraf did not mean that and again, repeatedly, President Pervez Musharraf had to make the denial that he never intended to say that Simla Agreement and Lahore Declaration were dismissed. He struggled hard to give the interpretation that these Agreements did not yield results.

The very same military ruler had to come over here. It was a great sight when he showered rose petals at Rajghat, on the *Samadhi* of the Father of the Nation. The vociferous warmonger writes in the visitors' book at Rajghat − "Never has a requirement of his ideals been so severely questioned as today, specially in the context of India-Pakistan relations. May his soul rest in peace".

Another important question raised particularly by hon. Members Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav and Shri Madhavrao Scindia was : Did our Prime Minister take up the issue of securing the release of 54 Prisoners of War languishing in Pakistani jails. That was their question. Our Prime Minister did take up the issue. This is the opening statement of

our Prime Minister at the delegation level talks on 15th July. I quote : "We have consistently, for over two decades, urged Pakistan to release the 54 Indian Prisoners of War who, we strongly believe, remain in your custody, which is a human problem. I would urge the Pakistan State to take urgent and purposeful action to end the agony of the families of those soldiers". What more do you want? He took up the issue with the President of Pakistan.

Sir, it is ridiculous on the part of the Congress Members to raise this issue. When they were holding the reins of the Government and when they released 93,000 Pakistani Prisoners of War, did they secure the release of these 54 Prisoners of War? Is it not a shame on their part? Are they ou not ashamed about it? What were they doing all these years? Atalji came just 23 years ago. What have they been doing? When they released 93,000 Prisoners of War they could not secure the release of these 54 Prisoners of War. What right have they got today to put that question?

Sir, I have got all respect for our Press people, the media. It is to protect the Fundamental Rights, to defend the Fundamental Rights and to defend the rights of Freedom of Press etc. I had also undergone more than 12 months of imprisonment in the dark and dungeon cells of prisons during the days of Emergency. But I feel so sad about the attitude and aptitude of our media persons, particularly those of the Press and the electronic media. They were giving all kudos to the President of Pakistan. But they did not realise the basic factor that the President of Pakistan, the military dictator who has proclaimed himself the President of Pakistan and turned himself into the President of Pakistan, has violated all the basic norms of diplomacy.

Did he not violate all the norms of diplomacy? When such Summit level talks take place, those who participate in such Summits are not expected to divulge the details of discussion. With all hospitality, we have welcomed him. Ours is a democracy, the tallest democracy of the world. So, we have given our hospitality, but that hospitality was exploited by General Musharraf, violating all the norms of diplomacy. Instead of condemning that attitude, news is always made sensational. Is not the Prime Minister second to none in this country to defend the interest of the country? After the misadventure by General Musharraf at the breakfast meeting, the Prime Minister of India released the statement. Shri Somnath Chatterjee raised a question that only after that, the Prime Minister released the statement. Yes, he did the correct things because Pervez Musharraf violated the norms of diplomacy. The posterity will tell about this. In his statement, he has clearly stated:

> "We remain committed to the establishment of trust and confidence, to developing mutually beneficial cooperation and to addressing all outstanding issues including Jammu and Kashmir. It is with these perspectives that we continued a few decisions in advance of your visit aimed at addressing some of the mutual concerns of our people. They relate to peace and security, to the development of people to people ties and promote contacts by facilitating travel. We look forward to further detailed exchange of views on all issues including that of Jammu and Kashmir. You are fully aware of our views on this subject and we have had yours. We cannot deny that there are vast differences between us on this. We are willing to address these differences and to move forward."

General Musharraf faced the music in Kargil, the music of fiasco and failure, and once again, here at Agra Summit because he is no match to the Prime Minister of India or he is rather amateur in the field of diplomacy. Therefore, our Prime Minister says:

> "But for this, it is important to create a conducive atmosphere. The terrorism and violence being promoted in the State across its borders do not help to create such an atmosphere. "

The words in the next sentence are very important. It says:

> "We will counter them resolutely. Let no one think that India does not have the resolve, strength or stamina to continue resisting terrorism and violence, but they do not promote meaningful dialogue. "

Our Prime Minister made the statement on the face of the President of Pakistan. When, repeatedly in the breakfast meeting, in the luncheon meeting, Shri Pervez Musharraf was insisting on Kashmir as the core issue, then, our Prime Minister has indicated that the core of the core issue is the occupation of one-third of the territory of Kashmir. It was asked by some of our friends that one-third territory of Kashmir was under their occupation and whether the Prime Minister took up this issue with them. Yes, he rightly took up this issue with them. Then, he has said:

> "Your aggression, the Pakistan Army regulars' aggression in the year 1947 â€¦"

Shri Pervez Musharraf did not expect this thing. He was terribly shocked. He said that that was the past history and do not go into the past. Then, our Prime Minister had to remind him that if he cited incidents of the history, it had to be taken in totality.

Sir, some of the newspapers in Pakistan have given the correct picture. It is second Kargil for Musharraf. This is the inning of Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee.

My friends referred to the situation in the Kashmir Valley. Who is responsible for that? I raise my accusing finger against the Congress Party, which is solely responsible for the present scenario. The credit goes to Sheikh Abdullah, the Lion of Kashmir. When Raja Hari Singh signed the Accession Treaty, he clearly stated that, "because of Sheikh Abdullah, today we are enjoying the benefits and fruits". What reward was given to Sheikh Abdullah? The reward was imprisonment for 22 years. Then, what did you do?

At one point of time, I met Dr. Abdullah at Chandigarh. At that time, the Chief Minister of Punjab, Shri Barnala, convened an all-party meeting. I told him not to forget the words of his father. When I met Sheikh Abdullah in 1980, he stated, "My dear friend, do not forget one basic thing that there is no place for friendship or gratitude in the dictionary of the Congress Party".

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : That is why, he sided with us.

SHRI VAIKO : I told and cautioned Dr. Abdullah, "Be very careful. These are the lessons of the past". What happened afterwards? When he was having his morning cup of tea, he came to know that his Government was dismissed. Elections are going to take place there. Whoever wins there, we are not bothered. I would say that in 1977, when Shri Morarji Desai was the Prime Minister -- we have to give the credit to him -- the elections were free and fair. However, whenever the Congress was in the saddle, the elections were always rigged elections in Kashmir. Of course, shortly, elections are going to take place there. It will be free and fair elections. However, you forgot one thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Vaiko, please conclude your speech.

SHRI VAIKO : You are solely responsible for what has happened in the Kashmir Valley. Therefore, our Prime Minister has taken the right steps.

There is one more thing. Some of our friends, including Shri Chandra Shekhar, said that our Prime Minister should not go to Pakistan because he does certain things. After his Lahore trip, success came in the international arena. Likewise, he knows when, where, how and what steps to take.

Therefore, at the Agra Summit, we do not know with what intentions he came, it was a great failure for Musharraf. The only thing is that the Press, the media, did not highlight it in the proper perspective. Otherwise, in the annals of history, in the saga of Indo-Pak relations, this Agra Summit is going to figure very prominently.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, thank you very much for having given me this opportunity to participate in this debate on Agra Summit.

At the outset, I would like to say that on the 9th of July, an all-party leaders meeting was convened by the Prime Minister in which the External Affairs Minister also participated. We all said that cross-border terrorism should be the main agenda, and Line-of-Control should be the border resolution. At that meeting, the Prime Minister told that he has some agenda for that purpose. At that time, whatever I had spoken on behalf of AIADMK is there in the minutes of the meeting. The speakers who have spoken should see the minutes of the all-party leaders meeting first. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRAKASH YASHWANT AMBEDKAR : Only some party leaders were called, and it was not an all-party leaders meeting.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN : The Prime Minister's speech is in print there. After the Summit, the Prime Minister said, "Whenever he talked of cross-border terrorism, Musharraf raised the issue of Kashmir".

When he talked about the Line of Control, Shri Musharraf raised the issue of Kashmir. The Prime Minister himself admitted that he did not come with any agenda. The Prime Minister himself admitted that it was a failure. The Government can now say that it was a success. But it is all there in the minutes of that meeting. The Prime Minister openly said in the all-party meeting that the talks were futile. I told in that meeting that Shri Parvez Musharraf came as a tourist to India. He did not have the diplomacy to talk to the tallest Prime Minister of a great democratic country. I also told the Prime Minister that he should not have shaken hands with Shri Pervez Musharraf because he has not got the international recognition as the President; it was a self-proclaimed one. It was also deliberated in that meeting that the Pakistan leadership, especially the military Rulers, was not for a solution of the Kashmir issue. The Military Generals are enjoying their lives and the fruits of that country by proclaiming a war. If there is a settlement of the Kashmir issue, then the Military Generals cannot survive. In that case they would have to work as subordinates to the political leadership. They would have to salute the elected President of that country. All these are there in the minutes of that meeting. This is because some reference in this House was made that the talks were helpful, the talks were conclusive, the talks were fruitful and some achievement was made by India through these talks. But definitely, our hon. Prime Minister and our hon. Minister for External Affairs would not accept that

proposition.

Sir, there was a report of a Group of four Ministers on reforming the national security system. The four Ministers were the Minister of Finance, Shri Yashwant Sinha, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Jaswant Singh, the former Defence Minister, Shri George Fernandes and one other Minister ...(*Interruptions*) We had said in that meeting that the hon. Prime Minister should take this as a protocol for deliberations in that international Summit meeting. It is because the recommendations contained in the report on reforming the national security system, that was submitted by the Group of Ministers in February, 2001, was not deliberated here at all. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ANADI SAHU (BERHAMPUR, ORISSA): Sir, that is a confidential report and that report is not to be discussed here. It has been circulated amongst the Members and later on either the Home Minister or any other concerned person would speak about it. I think, it is not to be discussed here. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN : Yes, it has been circulated amongst the Members of Parliament ...(*Interruptions*) Sir, I am a member of the Standing Committee on Home Affairs. Our Committee is going to deliberate on this report...(*Interruptions*) Sir, everybody referred to the question of cross-border terrorism. Cross-border terrorism was the main issue that was to be raised in that Summit meeting.

Sir, under the Chairmanship of Shri Pranab Mukherjee, a team, of which I was a Member, visited Kargil. We saw the geography and topography of the area. We saw how Kargil was affected. We could see how infiltration, engineered by the ISI, across the border was taking place.

Sir, what happened after the Summit and after the departure of Shri Pervez Musharraf? The pilgrims to Amarnath were killed. Was it *bona fide*? Was his participation in the Summit *bona fide*? He had diabolic intentions to come to India.

He was not in a diplomatic dress while shaking hands with our Prime Minister. He was wearing a collarless shirt tucked in. He was casual. He was not serious. In fact, he was not serious on any issue. Our Prime Minister is a seasoned politician. He is a great parliamentarian. He is a Prime Minister elected by the people of India, by the Members of Parliament belonging to NDA. We told the Prime Minister in the all-party meeting that his approach on the interaction was totally different from that of the General. A week before he was to come to India, General Musharraf proclaimed himself as the President of Pakistan to gain at protocol. The elected Prime Minister of a country cannot honour him because he was not elected by his people. He was not accountable to any Parliament. The National Assembly of Pakistan is dissolved. How can a President who is not accountable to his country's Parliament be honoured like that? We should not have negotiated with him.

SHRI HANNAN MOLLAH (ULUBERIA): He elected himself.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN : Yes, he is electoral college for himself.

The summit has ended in futility. People of India were carried over by different impressions created by the Press. Our media was enamoured by the presence of General Musharraf here. I saw several magazines. The Indian Press has covered all that General Musharraf said. One of them has said the General Musharraf was better than an elected Government. Our Indian Press says that he was better than an elected Government. All his speeches and all his interviews were published by Indian Press and gave international recognition to him. This is not the expected form of freedom of Press.

I would say that Kashmir problem is a perennial problem. I said in the all-party meeting that the Prime Minister should take a tough decision, a hard line decision, to deal with Pakistan. I am reminded of an experience I had about 20 years ago, when I was visiting the United Nations. I met Advaniji and I introduced myself to him. At that time I was the Deputy-Speaker of Tamil Nadu Assembly. We came to the ground floor of the building together in the lift. There was a coffee shop on the ground floor of the building which was being run by a Pakistani. On coming to know that we were from India, he said that he wanted to see India torn into pieces. That was the impression a Pakistani running a coffee shop in the United Nations building had about India about 20 years back! That was what was running in the blood of that Pakistani. So, we cannot believe Pakistan. We cannot believe Pervez Musharraf. But, in our democratic system the diplomatic way of approaching another country is by way of dialogue. We cannot end the dialogue. We have to negotiate. We have to talk to Pakistan. We should go on talking to them. We have been talking and talking and talking for fifty-four years. Their Governments, whether elected or military, have not helped in solving this issue. They do not have any inclination to solve this problem.

As far as the Prisoners Of War are concerned, our Prime Minister raised this issue with Musharraf and the General said that he would personally look into it. One of my friends said that it goes to the credit of Musharraf. But, after reaching Islamabad, Pervez Musharraf said that there were no Prisoners Of War in Pakistan.

After going back, he said that there was nobody to be released. So, he has not released anybody. Our Prime

Minister, a democratically elected Prime Minister, was made to believe that Parvez Musharraf will, through his diplomatic channel, communicate his agenda.

In the meeting, I had said and it has come in the Press also that he came to the Summit without a piece of paper. I said that while going to court, even we use to take one or two papers with us. But he came to attend this Summit without any paper or agenda.

Shri P.A. Sangma said that he had not brought with him some of the important Ministers. In that meeting, I had already said that General Musharraf had come here just as a tourist. He was visiting Taj Mahal and taking photographs. He was our guest. We were his host. But we cannot get that type of hospitality in that country. If our leader goes there, people of that country will not tolerate him. If the Prime Minister reacts on Kargil in a negative way, he would not be accorded such type of reception. We are a great people. Our country is great. We have traditions. General Parvez has no traditions. He has held only the military traditions. He can salute. That is all.

Sir, he did not go into any of the problems. He did not go into any of the recommendations of the GoMs. He talked as if there is was line of control. He told that the line of control was not acceptable to him. When our Prime Minister talked about the cross-border terrorism, he said that there was no cross-border terrorism, it was the freedom struggle going on there. Whatever he said was negative.

So, we the Members of Parliament along with the Government, should take a tough stand though not to the extent of declaring a war. We have to interfere in their country to get somebody elected as President democratically. We have to infiltrate. They are infiltrating everyday. ISI agents are here. It is being reported in the Press that the ISI agents are printing and circulating notes in India. Our Minister has also said that the ISI agents are operating here and cross-border terrorism is going on here.

India is in a transition stage. So, at this juncture, I would emphatically say that the recent talk was a failure. It is admitted by the hon. Prime Minister also. There need not be any support for the Prime Minister saying that it is a success for India. He himself has admitted that it is a failure. When the hon. Prime Minister has admitted that it was a failure, why should Members say that it is a success? He has said it openly in the meeting. One may call for the minutes of All Parties Leaders' meeting. I think, it must be circulated to everybody. Before the Prime Minister convened that meeting, we conferred with him. The agenda was prepared but it could not be taken up. As he came empty-handed, he also went back empty-handed. Our Prime Minister was there to have a dialogue which was not respected by General Musharraf.

Sir, in the television, I saw our hon. President K.R. Narayanan receiving General Musharraf. My view is that Musharraf should have been received by our Generals here and not by Shri K.R. Narayanan, the great President of India. Similarly, our Prime Minister was also receiving him in Oberoi Hotel of Agra. Do they also receive you like this in Pakistan? No. Our Press had also showed him as if he was the promoter of democracy.

Yesterday in Delhi, I saw in one of the papers that his name was mentioned for giving Nobel Peace Prize. What are we doing? It is mentioned in *The Statesman dated 31st July.* In one of the papers, it was reported that he has been recommended with Nobel Peace Prize. Is it for the aggression and killings in Kargil or for not cooperating with the Prime Minister? Does the Military General know about *Panchsheel*? He does not know about non-aggression; he does not know about mutual benefit; he does not know about peaceful co-existence; he does not know about non-interference in other's internal matters; and he does not know about *Panchsheel*. That is why, the Prime Minister was fed up. The Prime Minister said that whenever he raised the question of cross-border terrorism, General Musharraf raised the question of Kashmir. The Prime Minister admitted it.

Once the Prime Minister said that Kashmir is an issue, but General Musharraf said that it is a dispute; and for that General Musharraf convened a Press Meet and said that to define a dispute and an issue, we were not able to come to an understanding; how can we settle international problems. He said this. So, after coming here, he has created another problem.

So, I would appeal to the Prime Minister to be more cautious in his international approaches. I would like to say that in all international matters, he might convene all-party meetings, not only NDA meetings. He can convene all party meetings to discuss international issues, and for local issues, he can convene NDA meetings. He can convene NDA meetings to sort out local politics because they also want to get votes. But for international problems, we are with the Government of India, which I told in that meeting. In that meeting, - Shri Jaswant Singh knows this − I said that in the case of all international issues, he can convene not only NDA meetings, but all-party meetings prior and after the Summit. He can brief the NDA first and leaders of all parties after that. We are all here to solve international disputes or issues. So, I would say that hereafter to solve any international problem or any international issue, you might consult all the political parties along with NDA partners. We are not going to quarrel with you.

Shri Vaiko was speaking about friendship and gratitude. I did not say anything at that time. Whatever is happening

in India and locally, it is happening in foreign countries. That is all. Who has gratitude? Who is friendly in political affairs? After elections, they are separate. Nobody is showing any gratitude. So, it is not Sheikh Abdulla who has said that, but it is happening in practice. I would say that this Summit is a failure. Shri Jaswant Singh may know that it is a failure. The Prime Minister said that it was a failure. I am not happy about its failure. I want you to win over General Musharraf. Whatever help and support you want, we will extend and we are all with you. I told this on that day itself. We are all with the Prime Minister and we are all with the Government of India. This is not our internal party problem. This is not our internal Indian problem. It is an international problem concerning the sovereignty and integrity of our great nation.

Shri Jaswant Singh, the External Affairs Minister is a responsible Minister and he is a good negotiator. He is capable of conducting dialogues. He can get hold of anybody. I request him to get hold of General Musharraf, convince him and bring him under his control or under the Control of the Government of India. Otherwise, he will create more problems. After his departure from India, Amarnath pilgrims were killed; after his departure or after the Summit was over, unrest increased in Kashmir.

So, I would say that we are not happy about this failure. After the announcement by the Prime Minister, a newsperson asked our Leader, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, about it and she immediately said that it was going to be a failure. Everyone knew it. What could the General talk to an elected Prime Minister? He did not talk about the Lahore Declaration. He did not talk about the Simla Agreement. He did not try to go to any of the previous protocols.

We are with the Central Government, with the Government of India. We want the Indian land to be intact. We will not part with even an inch of our land to Pakistan or any other country for that matter. We want the Government of India to curb the cross-border terrorism and to curb the militancy. The Government should protect the people of India and we are with the Government.

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी (देवरिया) : सभापति महोदय, शासन की एक परिभाषा है, गवर्नमेंट की एक परिभाषा है संस्कृत में -- " कृतम ना कृतम, अन्यथा कृतम।" अर्थात्, करेंगे, नहीं करेंगे, दूसरी तरह से करेंगे। और जो गवर्नमेंट इसमें सक्षम नहीं है 'will do, would not do and do it in another way'.

1942 hrs. (डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह पीठासीन हुए)

यह गवर्नमेंट की सक्षमता की निशानी है और यही हमारी परेशानी है। क्योंकि केवल एक तरीका पिछले 50 साल में अपनाया गया है। दूसरा तरीका जब अपनाया जाता है तो हर तरह के लोगों की सोच में, केवल हमारे विपक्षी दलों की सोच में नहीं, मीडिया की सोच में, सबकी सोच में आता है कि कोई और तरीका किया जाए तो वह गलत है।

सभापति जी, मुलायम सिंह जी ने बातचीत शुरू की और उन्होंने बहुत अहम बात कही। वैसे आम तौर से समाजवादी पार्टी के सभी लोग चाहते हैं और प्रायः हर बात का वे राजनीतिकरण करते हैं, लेकिन इस हालत में उन्होंने कहा कि 'युद्ध हम जीतते रहे और कूटनीति में हम बिलकुल असफल रहे। हर युद्ध के बाद हमारी सीमाएं सिकुड़ती रहीं, पाकिस्तान को दो टूक जवाब दे देना चाहिए था '। ये सब बातें जो उन्होंने कहीं, बुनियादी बातें कहीं। हम उन्हें बधाई देते हैं कि कम से कम उन्होंने इसका तो राजनीतिकरण नहीं किया, लेकिन जब हमारे माधवराव जी बोल रहे थे, तो हमने देखा कि वे बिलकुल हाशिए पर बोल रहे हैं। वे एक बहुत अच्छे वकील की तरह, अच्छे अंगरेजी के एक्सप्रेशन में वे अपनी बात कह गए। जहां तक हमें अंगरेजी समझ में आती है, उसके अनुसार मैं यह कह सकता हूं कि वे एक बहुत खराब केस को बहुत अच्छे शब्दों में आर्ग्यू कर रहे हैं। मूल बात से हट कर, बात कही गई। उन्होंने शिमला एग्रीमेंट की बात कही-

'Simla Agreement which was the benchmark for three decades

of our relations with Pakistan, 'was a bad balance sheet at Agra.'

शिमला समझौता कैसा बैंच मार्क था, उसके बारे में, मैं अभी चर्चा करूंगा, लेकिन मूल बात क्या है, वह हमारे संगमा जी ने भी कही थी और एक बार मैं फिर दोहरा दूं कि मूल बात 1994 में हुई और वह दिनांक 22 फरवरी, 1994 में इसी संसद में सर्वसम्मति से पारित प्रस्ताव के द्वारा हुई थी।

> "Firmly declares that the State of Jammu and Kashmir has been, is and shall be an integral part of India and any attempt to separate it from the rest of the country will be resisted by all necessary means.
>
> India has the will and the capacity to firmly counter all designs against its unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity and demands that Pakistan must vacate areas of Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir which they have occupied through aggression and resolves all attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of India will be met resolutely."

रैजोल्यूशन में यही मूल बात थी। इसके बारे में अब सफलता की क्या परिभाषा है, किसी बातचीत में सफलता की परिभाषा क्या है? क्या केवल यह है कि हर तरह का एक रैजोल्यूशन पास हो, सबके दस्तखत हों, वही सफलता की परिभाषा है? सफलता की क्या परिभाषा है क्योंकि हम लोग अभी तक जो परिभाषा देखते आए हैं, उस परिभाषा से 1971 का शिमला ऐग्रीमैंट एक सफल ऐग्रीमैंट था। लेकिन मेरी परिभाषा से उससे खराब बैंचमार्क हमको उस हालत में कोई भी सरकार नहीं दे सकती थी।

उसकी डिटेल देखनी चाहिए क्योंकि आज जो हमारी परेशानियां हैं, वे सब 1971 के शिमला ऐग्रीमैंट के बाद हुई हैं और उसे गौर से देखना चाहिए। इस बैंचमार्क पर दूरबीन की नजर लगानी चाहिए। क्या स्थिति है वहां पर? 1971 में पाकिस्तान एक हारा हुआ देश था, उसे हम रणयुद्ध में हरा चुके थे, उसका आधा हिस्सा हम उससे अलग कर चुके थे, उससे आजाद कर चुके थे। एक देश का आधा हिस्सा इक्कीसवीं सदी में सोलह दिन में अलग कर देना, हमारे पास 93,000 सैनिक थे। इस स्थिति में श्री जुल्फिकार अली भुट्टो को बुलाया गया। उस वक्त क्या प्रैपरेशन की गई थी, मैं जानना चाहता हूं। केवल दो चीजें उस शिमला ऐग्रीमैंट में हैं। बायलेटरलिज़्म, जिसकी दूसरे दिन ही पाकिस्तान ने अवहेलना करनी शुरू की। पाकिस्तान ने कभी भी बायलेटरलिज़्म नहीं माना, हमेशा वह कोशिश करता रहा कि एक तीसरी पार्टी को ले आए, उसे इंटरनैशनलाइज़ करे और हमेशा यू.एन. सिक्युरिटी काउंसिल के रैजोल्यूशन पर जाता रहा। कश्मीर के बारे में कोई भी बात नहीं की गई। 1971 के ऐग्रीमैंट में क्या बात की गई? उसके पहले ताशकंद ऐग्रीमैंट भी हुआ है, केवल एक औपरेटिव पोर्शन ताशकंद ऐग्रीमैंट में हुआ है। तीसरी पार्टी को इस्तेमाल करके दूसरे देश जाकर ताशकंद ऐग्रीमैंट हुआ। क्या प्रैपरेशन की गई थी, वह मुझे नहीं मालूम है लेकिन एक ही औपरेटिव पोर्शन ताशकंद ऐग्रीमैंट में है।

> "The Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan have agreed that all Army personnel of the two countries shall be withdrawn not later than 25th February, 1966 to the positions they held prior to 5th August, 1965 and both sides shall observe the cease fire line."

आज इसलिए साथ चला गया। यही वह है जिसमें हमने हाजी पीर दर्रा दिया है जोकि खास दर्रा है जिसके जरिए आतंकवादी हमारे यहां आते हैं। यही एक औपरेटिव पोर्शन हुआ। 1971 में बायलेटरलिज़्म की तो बात है, यह मै समझता हूं लेकिन आखिर में क्या कहा जाता है, यह सुनने योग्य है।

> "â€¦including the question of repatriation of prisoners of war and civilian internees, a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir and the resumption of diplomatic relations."

फाइनल सैटलमेंट तो जम्मू-कश्मीर में कहां किया गया, कैसे किया, कब किया गया? उस पर क्या तैयारी हुई, उस पर क्या काम हुआ, कुछ नहीं हुआ, जीरो। 93 हजार प्रिजनर्स हम लोगों ने उठाकर उनको दे दिये और आज जो आतंकवाद है, उसमें जब बार-बार यह हो कि एक देश, जिसको हम युद्ध में बुरी तरह हरा चुके हैं, जिसने हार मान ली है, 1965 में हार नहीं मानी, लेकिन 1971 में उनको हार माननी पड़ी। अगर उनको यह पता हो कि हर दफा जब हम टेबल पर आयेंगे तो हम बिल्कुल पाक साफ आराम से जो हमको चाहिए, वह हमको दान में मिल जायेगा, 93 हजार प्रिजनर मिल जाएंगे और हमको कुछ नहीं करना पड़ेगा, तो उसका नतीजा यही होगा। कोई यहां पर कह सकता है कि उससे सुनहरा मौका, उससे अच्छा मौका कभी भी हिन्दुस्तान को जम्मू-कश्मीर का सैटलमेंट करने का मिलेगा? कोई कह सकता है तो वह कहे कि उस स्थिति में जब हम थे, तब हमने किसी तरह का सैटलमेंट नहीं किया। क्या प्रिपरेशन हुई थी, प्रिपरेशन की बहुत बात हो रही है। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि हम जब 93 हजार प्रिजनर्स दे रहे हैं तो कम से कम हमारे 54 प्रिजनर्स तो दे दें। क्या यही प्रिपरेशन थी? यह नहीं थी कि एक तिहाई हिस्सा कश्मीर का जो उनके पास है, वह हमको मिल जाये या किसी और तरीके से फाइनल सैटलमेंट हो जाये, क्या वहां पर यही प्रिपरेशन थी? आज जे.एन. दीक्षित साहब का आर्टिकल मैं पढ़ रहा था, 'do bring in the Simla spirit' हे भगवान, जब उस वक्त शिमला स्पिरिट लाकर हमने यह-यह किया है तो दोबारा शिमला स्पिरिट लाकर हम लोग क्या करेंगे। क्या उस समय यह भी सम्भव नहीं था कि हम पाकिस्तान से कह देते कि आपका सिक्योरिटी काउंसिल में जो रैजोल्यूशन है, उसको विथड्रा कर लीजिए? क्या यह भी सम्भव नहीं था कि आप किसी क्रास बोर्डर के आदमी नहीं भेजेंगे, बार-बार कबायली नहीं भेजेंगे, क्या 1971 की वार के बाद कोई चीज दस्तखत से नहीं की जा सकती थी? हमको बताया जा रहा है कि यह वार्ता फेल हो गई। अगर उस वक्त भारत सरकार नहीं करने का साहस जुटा पाती कि जब तक ये चीजें नहीं होंगी, तब तक हम नहीं मानेंगे। वह साहस चाहिए, 'कृतम ना कृतम' वह साहस जुटा पाती तो आज एक भी समस्या इनमें से नहीं होती। समस्या तो वहीं से है, क्योंकि जब वे हार गये, जब उन्हें मालूम हो गया कि हम रणयुद्ध में इनसे जीत नहीं सकते हैं, हमारी बड़ी खराब हालत हो जायेगी, तब से यह शुरू हुआ। आतंकवाद की तभी से शुरूआत हुई, तभी से उसकी प्लानिंग हुई और आज हम जिस हालत में पहुंचे हैं, उसमें यह खास बात सोचने की है, इसलिए हमको इस बात की सीख जरा कम देनी चाहिए कि प्रिपरेशन कम हुई है। यह सीख बहुत अच्छी नहीं होती है। अभी मणिशंकर अय्यर जी चले गये, हमें चिट देकर गये हैं कि उन्हें कुछ काम है, लेकिन उन्होंने कहा कि हमने मुशर्रफ को किसलिए बुलाया था, क्या खाली हाथ भेजने के लिए बुलाया था। क्या यह हमारी कोई जिम्मेदारी बनती है कि कोई आये तो हम किसी तरह से कोई न कोई दस्तावेज साइन करके भेजें? 1971 में इसी दस्तावेज में है कि आखिरी दिन तक बातचीत नहीं चल रही थी और आखिरी दिन यह सोचकर कि अगर हम उनको कुछ भेंट नहीं देंगे तो जुल्फिकार अली भुट्टो वापस जाएंगे तो उन्हें आर्मी वाले हटा देंगे। जैसे हमारे पास कोई शक्ति है कि पाकिस्तान में मिलिट्री रूलर रहे या डैमोक्रेसी आये, उसको हम रैगुलेट कर सकते हैं। ऐसी कोई बात नहीं, जुल्फिकार अली भुट्टो साहब कुछ लेकर गये, लेकिन साल भर में हटा दिये गये, खत्म कर दिये गये और बार-बार यह होता रहा। यह बिल्कुल गलत ख्याल है कि उनका क्या होगा। यह साहस जुटाना बहुत जरूरी है कि जहां राट्रहित का सवाल है, वहां अगर कोई शिखर वार्ता में कोई मसौदा बनता है,

उस पर दस्तखत होता है या नहीं होता है, यह हमारी जिम्मेदारी नहीं है। जब दस्तखत होगा तो उन चीजों पर होगा जो कि हम चाहते हैं। हम मूल रूप से क्या बातें चाहते हैं, इसमें मेरे ख्याल से पूरे सदन में किसी को कोई शक नहीं है। इसीलिए बार-बार सब लोग कह रहे हैं कि बुलाना जरूरी है, बात करनी चाहिए, लेकिन इसमें यह-यह गलती हुई। माधवराव जी ने एक-दो आर्टिकल का जिक्र किया, जिसमें एक आर्टिकल मणि शंकर जी का है। "Beijing to Kargil to Agra : Weary travellers and unsuccessful diplomats." इसमें कुछ यह भी पढ़ा आपने कि किस तरह गोपी अरोड़ा के काम करने की वजह से राजीव जी की बीजिंग यात्रा कितनी सफल रही। इस बारे में डिटेल में बोला था और इसे बड़ा इंटरेस्टिंग माना था। इत्तेफाक से मुझे भी इंटरेस्टिंग लगता है, लेकिन दूसरी वजह से। इसमें मणि शंकर जी ने लिखा है -

> "Atal Bihari Vajpayee's fatal flaw is that he is not a statesman but a poet, not a diplomatist but a qawwal.
>
> Beyond that his is a dismal record of disaster after disaster in diplomacy. Vajpayee was the External Affairs Minister in the Morarji Desai Cabinet. His over weening desire was to use his portfolio as the launching pad to prove that what the Congress could not do, he, Houdini Vajpayee, was capable of doing."

यह हमें बड़ा इंटरेस्टिंग लगा। मैं सवाल पूछना चाहता हूं अगर इतने अनभिज्ञ हैं वाजपेयी जी कूटनीति में तो क्या वजह थी कि सब कांग्रेस के लीडर्स को छोड़ कर, जब अंतरराट्रीय पेचीदा मामला आता था तो नेता प्रति पक्ष के हिसाब से इंडियन डेलीगेशन के लीडर उनको बना कर जिनीवा भेजा जाता था। मैं यह मानता हूं कि एक परिवार को छोड़ कर दूसरे को प्रधान मंत्री मानने के लिए मणि शंकर जी तैयार नहीं हैं। लेकिन कांग्रेस पार्टी में कोई नेता उन्हें नहीं मिला, कोई कव्वाल नहीं मिला, जबकि मुझे दोनों की कमी वहां दिखाई नहीं दे रही है। यह चीज बड़े ख्याल रखने की है, क्योंकि अटल जी भारतीय जनता पार्टी के प्रधान मंत्री नहीं हैं, वे भारत के प्रधान मंत्री हैं। इंडियन एक्सप्रेस कोई लोकल पेपर नहीं है। उसको सब लोग पढ़ते हैं। आप इसका जवाब दीजिए कि क्या कोई इतना बड़ा कूटनीतिक नेता नहीं मिला।

इसमें एक चीज और है जो उन्होंने नहीं लिखी है। लिखा है कि कितना अच्छा प्रिपरेशन करके बीजिंग चले गए और कितना अच्छा विजिट रहा। एक चीज नहीं लिखी, जिसको मैं 'राग दरबारी ' बोलूंगा। जब बीजिंग जाने का होता है तो हमारे पुराने नेता लोग एक राग अलापना शुरू करते हैं। Tibet is not only autonomous, it is also part of China. पहले पेपर में आएगा, उसके बाद नेता लोग बोलना शुरू करेंगे और जाने के पहले प्रधान मंत्री बोलना शुरू करेंगे। जब पहले से ही आप राग दरबारी शुरू करते हैं और एक शब्द 50 साल में चीन से नहीं कहला पाए कि कश्मीर भी हमारा हिस्सा है। हम यह राग दरबारी गाते रहे हैं। उसमें कोई बहुत मुश्किल नहीं है कि वहां जाकर बोल आए और सब लोग कहें कि कोई बात नहीं है। राजीव जी ही नहीं, उनके नानाश्री ने भी कहा था कि तिब्बत आपका है, बिना उनसे पूछे। इस तरह हम लोग अपने राट्र के हित की बात करेंगे। अगर इनको कह दीजिए कि आप कश्मीर की बात करेंगे तो हमारे पास जो मुद्दे हैं, उनके बारे में पहले बात की जाएगी। अगर मान लिया जाए पहले उन्होंने कहा और फिर भी हमने बुलाया और मैसेज दिया कि हम अपनी जगह से नहीं डिगेंगे, तो इसमें प्रिपरेशन की क्या बात है, इसमें तो वाहवाही होनी चाहिए नहीं तो पेपर में ऐसे-ऐसे आर्टिकल निकलेंगे, यह भी इसी का है।

20.00 hrs.

"Reading the latest from India on the Internet, one has to wonder as to when our political players lost their concern for our national interest. Or perhaps more realistically one who assumes that one have never to lose. It is, therefore, not surprising that the world considers (that is if they consider us at all) Indians as being the perfect role models for the `Crabs in the Open Pots' fable.

The latest example of this is the strange reaction of some political parties to the recent Agra Summit. While the rest of the world, including Pakistan, has displayed a realistic understanding of the nature and complexity of an issue that has been plaguing us for 50 plus years, petty Indian politicians have no shame in attacking the Government."

यह भी इंडियन एक्सप्रैस का है, उसी के दूसरे दिन के बाद है।

सभापति महोदय : अब समाप्त करिए। वक्ताओं की सूची लम्बी है।

श्री प्रकाश मणि त्रिपाठी : हमें थोड़ा समय और दीजिए। यह पहली बार है जबकि गुलाम कश्मीर के एक तिहाई हिस्से के बारे में जोरदार बात हुई है। कोर ऑफ कोर इश्यू के बारे में जोरदार बात हुई है। अटल जी ने कहा कि हम इतिहास बदल सकते हैं, भूगोल नहीं बदल सकते हैं और वह भूगोल अपनी जगह पर है और वह भूगोल सबको मालूम है कि कहां है। इससे साफ शब्दों में इसके बारे में नहीं कहा जा सकता। हम इस बात पर यह कहेंगे कि इस सदन को भी विश्वास करना चाहिए कि वह एक तिहाई हिस्सा भारत का है। वह एक तिहाई हिस्सा हमें वापस उनसे लेना है और बॉटम लाइन की बात संगमा जी कर रहे थे, उन्होंने बहुत अच्छी बातें कही। यह बॉटम लाइन इस पर आकर रुकनी चाहिए।

परवेज मुशर्रफ जी क्या चाहते हैं? उन्होंने आकर ऐलान कर दिया कि हुर्रियत लोग कश्मीर का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं लेकिन वह किसका प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं, यह हम लोग सब जानते हैं। वह भी पाकिस्तान का प्रतिनिधित्व करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं, यह हम लोगों के दिमाग में साफ है, इसलिए पाकिस्तान की भलाई क्या है, इससे उनको कोई मतलब नहीं है और यहां मैं संगमा जी से पूरी तरह से सहमत हूं और इस बात को ख्याल में रखते हुए हमें आगे बात करनी चाहिए।

पहली दफा संयुक्त राट्र के महासचिव ने कहा है कि कश्मीर में यू.एन. रिजोल्यूशन अब कोई मतलब नही रखता। इसका एक महत्व है कि पहली दफा सैक्रेटरी जनरल ने स्वयं बात कही है कि यू.एन. रिजोल्यूशन का कोई मतलब नही रहा है लेकिन जो कुछ डिप्लोमैसी हो, उसको हमें जमीन पर तय करना पड़ेगा और जमीन पर जब हम क्रॉस-बॉर्डर टैरेरिज्म को खत्म करेंगे तो अपने आप डिप्लोमैसी अपनी जगह पर आ जाएगी। आज तक यह दुर्भाग्य रहा है कि हमारी सेनाएं बार-बार जमीन पर भी हर दम विजय पाती रही हैं और आकर टेबल पर डिप्लोमैट्स हारते रहे हैं। यह चीज बदलेगी। बहुत सी चीजें भारतीय जनता पार्टी और माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के नेतृत्व में बदल रही हैं। यह भी बदलेगी कि अब हमने यह कह दिया है कि जमीन पर भी इसको यथार्थ करके दिखाएंगे। इन्ही शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

श्रीमती कान्ति सिंह (बिक्रमगंज) : सभापति महोदय, समाजवादी पार्टी के आदरणीय मुलायम सिंह जी द्वारा प्रस्तुत नियम 193 के तहत बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण विाय पर आपने बोलने के लिए मुझे मौका दिया है, इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देना चाहती हूं।

महोदय, हमारा देश जब से आजाद हुआ, तब से लेकर आज तक पाकिस्तान के साथ हमारी चार बार लड़ाई हुई - पहला भारत और पाक के बीच संर्घा 1947-48 में हुआ, दूसरा 1965 में हुआ, तीसरा संर्घा 1971 में हुआ था और चौथा तब हुआ, जब लाहौर वार्ता 21 फरवरी, 1999 को हुई। वायपेयी जी ने लाहौर की ऐतिहासिक बस यात्रा की और लाहौर घोाणा पत्र पर हस्ताक्षर किए, जिसमें जम्मू-काश्मीर संबंधी सभी मुद्दों के समाधान का भरोसा दिलाया गया था। उस समय वाजपेयी जी ने कहा था - हालांकि यह संक्षिप्त यात्रा है। इससे लाहौर और दिल्ली के बीच की दूरी कम होगी। नवाज़ शरीफ का कहना था - इससे दोनों देशों के बीच जमीन की बर्फ टूटी है। लेकिन इस लाहौर वार्ता का परिणाम क्या निकला - कारगिल का युद्ध। इस युद्ध से हमारे 5000 से अधिक लोग मारे गए â€¦(व्यवधान) भारत-पाक शिखर वार्ता होने के पहले यानि जिस समय ताना-बाना बुना जा रहा था कि पाकिस्तान के साथ मैत्रीपूर्ण, सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण तैयार करके, हमारी आजादी के बाद से लड़ाई शुरू हुई थी, वार्ता के माध्यम से शान्ति व्यवस्था कायम की जाएगी। इसी के तहत पाकिस्तान के जनरल मुशर्रफ को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन्हें राट्रपति बनने के पहले ही दूरभाा पर मुबारकबाद दे दी। किस कारण से उन्होंने पहले मुबारकबाद दी, क्या वे सोचते थे कि मुबारकबाद देने से भारत-पाक वार्ता सफल हो जाएगी। इसी का परिणाम यह निकला कि उन्होंने एक फौजी शासक, जनरल परवेज़ मुशर्रफ, को राट्रपति के रूप में सबसे पहले पहचान दे दी, जबकि यह सबको पता था कि पाकिस्तान एक आतंकवादी देश के रूप में जाना जाता है। मैं यह मानती हूं कि आपसी समझौते के माध्यम से, वार्ता के द्वारा किसी भी समस्या का समाधान किया जाता है, लेकिन हम कैसे लोगों के साथ वार्ता करने पर विचार कर रहे हैं, इस पर हमें सोचना पड़ेगा। उस परिस्थिति में कहा जा सकता है कि प्रधानमंत्रीजी के अविवेकपूर्ण कदम ने पाकिस्तान का पीछा छुड़ा दिया यानि जो देश आतंकवादी देश के नाम से जाना जाता था, उसको हमारे देश के प्रधान मंत्री ने राट्रपति की पहचान दे दी। आप सब लोग जानते हैं कि बिन लादेन, जो दुनिया का सबसे बड़ा आतंकवादी है। वह हिन्दुस्तान का सबसे बड़ा दुश्मन हे। उसका सबसे बड़ा दोस्त कौन है- पाकिस्तान है, क्योंकि वह उसे संरक्षण देता है। मैं मानती हूं राट्रहित में शांति वार्ता होनी चाहिए, लेकिन शांति वार्ता से पहले हमें हर बिन्दुओं पर विचार करना चाहिए। करगिल के युद्ध में हजारों लोगों की जानें गईं, कितनी माताओं की गोद सूनी हुई, कितनी बहनों की राखी की कलाइयां सूनी हुईं, कितनी महिलाओं के सुहाग

उजाड़ने का काम किया। ऐसे शासक जनरल परवेज़ थे, जिन्होंने लोकतंत्र का गला घोंट कर, लोकप्रिय नवाज़ शरीफ को जेल भेज कर राट्रपति बनने का काम किया। ऐसे जनरल मुशर्रफ को आपने आमंत्रित किया।

महोदय, सबसे बड़ी बात जो सभी जानते हैं यह है कि पाकिस्तान मादक पदार्थों का सबसे बड़ा केन्द्र बना हुआ है, जिसमें मिलिट्री का पूरा हाथ होता है। उससे सारी दुनिया परेशान है। उसी मिलिट्री शासक को हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने राट्रपति के रूप में मान्यता दे दी, जबकि अंतर्राट्रीय परिप्रेक्ष्य में पाकिस्तान को उग्रवादी राट्र के रूप में घोति तक करने की चर्चा कर दी गई थी। आज इनके बिना सोचे-समझे उठाए गए कदम से ये सारी चीजें खत्म हो गईं। पूर्व के वक्ताओं ने बहुत सारी बातें कहीं। उन्होंने कहा कि जब सर्वदलीय बैठक बुलाई गई थी तो लोगों को ये बातें रखनी चाहिए थीं कि पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति को न बुलाया जाए। मैं समझती हूं कि हमारे दल के नेता ने आवाज उठाई थी कि भारत-पाक के बीच जो शिखर वार्ता होने जा रही है उसमें हमें किसी भी तरह से सफलता हासिल नहीं होने जा रही है, इसके बा वजूद भी उन्हें आमंत्रित किया गया।

मैं एक बात और कहना चाहूंगी आईपीयू, जो इंटर पार्लियामेंट्री यूनियन है, जिसकी राज्यसभा की उपाध्यक्ष श्रीमती नज़मा हेपतुल्ला जी अध्यक्ष हैं, जैसे ही उन्हें इस बात की जानकारी प्राप्त हुई कि पाकिस्तान में सैनिक शासन का कब्जा हो गया है, उन्होंने तुरंत उन्हें मेम्बरशिप से खत्म करने का काम किया था। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने ऐसे हालात में जनरल मुशर्रफ साहब को अपने यहां आमंत्रित किया, जब कि अमेरिका और दूसरे देशों के साथ मिल कर, दबाव डाल कर पाकिस्तान को आइसोलेट कर देना चाहिए था। उसके बदले आपने दुनिया में उन्हें सबसे पहले फौजी शासक के रूप में पहचान दे दी, जबकि हम जनतंत्र के हिमायती हैं और वैसे सैनिक शासक के हम सब लोग खिलाफ हैं। हमने ही सबसे पहले उन्हें राट्रपति के रूप में मान्यता दी, यह बहुत बड़ी विडम्बना की बात है। पाकिस्तानी कितने कट्टरपंथी हैं, इसे सिवाय प्रधान मंत्री जी के सारी दुनिया जानती है। उन्हें पता नहीं है कि पाकिस्तान के तानाशाह राट्रपति कश्मीर में सीमा पार उग्रवाद को जेहाद या स्वतंत्रता की, आजादी की लड़ाई कहते हैं। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहती हूं कि यह कैसा जेहाद है। क्या मासूम लोगों की हत्याएं करना ही जेहाद है?

बेगुनाह महिलाओं और बच्चों को मारना ही क्या जेहाद है। इस तरह की हत्याएं करना किस धर्म में लिखा है और किस धर्म में लिखा है कि इस तरह बेगुनाह लोगों की हत्याएं करना जेहाद है।

शिखर वार्ता के लिए जनरल मुशर्रफ हमारे देश में आये तो उनकी मंशा साफ थी। उनके आने से पहले ही मीडिया के माध्यम से हमारे देश के लोगों को जानकारी हो गयी थी कि वे सिर्फ कश्मीर मुद्दे पर ही बात करने के लिए आ रहे हैं। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हमारे यहां कोई एजेंडा वार्ता के लिए तैयार नहीं किया गया था। आदरणीय चन्द्रशेखर जी ने जो बातें यहां कहीं मैं उनसे पूर्णतः सहमत हूं। आखिर किस लिए आपने पाकिस्तान के शासक को यहां बुलाया था। जब लड़ाई में हमें हमेशा कामयाबी मिली है तो ऐसी जी-हुजूरी में हम क्यों पड़ें? जिसे जनतंत्र में विश्वास नहीं है ऐसे शासक की जी-हुजूरी में हम क्यों लगें, क्यों उससे शांति वार्ता करें? ऐसे लोगों से वार्ता करके हमें राहत कतई नहीं पहुंच सकती है। मेरा विश्वास है कि ऐसी शांति वार्ता से हम लोगों को कुछ नहीं दिला सकते हैं।

एक तरफ हमारे द्वारा युद्ध विराम कर दिया जाता है और दूसरी तरफ हमारे सैनिक उस दौरान ज्यादा मारे जाते हैं। युद्ध विराम करके हमें क्या सफलता मिली? हर जगह हम असफल हुए। कश्मीर के लोगों की और मेरे संसदीय क्षेत्र के लोगों की भी वहां हत्याएं हुईं ।

माननीय सुामा जी यहां बैठी नहीं हैं। मैं तो आपके माध्यम से उनको धन्यवाद और मुबारकबाद देना चाहती हूं कि उन्होंने अंतिम मौके पर टेली मीडिया के माध्यम से बताया कि हमारा मुद्दा क्या है? उन्होंने साफ कर दिया, नहीं तो जैसे यूटीआई के समय में हमारे प्रधानमंत्री जी कह रहे थे कि उन्हें इस्तीफा देना पड़ेगा, तो उस मुद्दे पर भी उन्हें इस्तीफा देने की बात कहनी पड़ती। हमारे ही देश में आकर जनरल मुशर्रफ हमें ही धता बताकर चले गये - यह अपमान जनक बात है।

हमें कोई भी वार्ता करने से पहले यह सबक लेना चाहिए कि हम पहले से भी ज्यादा तैयारी करके, अपनी जमीन से आतंकवाद को हमेशा के लिए खत्म कर दें। ऐसा न होने के कारण ही कश्मीर के सवाल का अंतर्राट्रीयकरण हो रहा है।

यह भारत सरकार की विफलता है। इसलिए भारत-पाक शिखर वार्ता सफल है या विफल, यह बात पूरी दुनिया की समझ में आ गई है। हर मुद्दे पर इस सरकार की जो कूटनीति है, उसमें हर तरह से इस सरकार को विफलता मिली है। कोई बात करने से पहले सोचना होगा। हम वैसे लोगों से गुहार करें जो कट्टरपंथी न हों, जो तानाशाह न हों और जो लोकतंत्र में विश्वास करते हों। मैं युद्ध की घोाणा की मांग नहीं कर रही हूं लेकिन लाहौर वार्ता के बाद हमने जो विफलता देखी, उसके आधार पर कहना चाहती हूं कि ऐसी वार्ता करने से कहीं सफलता नहीं मिलेगी। इन्हीं चन्द बातों के साथ बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

कोयला मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री (श्री सैयद शाहनवाज़ हुसैन) : सभापति महोदय, मैं आपका आभारी हूं कि बिहार की सम्मानित सांसद कांति सिह जी के बाद मुझे बोलने का अवसर प्रदान किया। वैसे मुझे इस बात का अहसास है कि हमारे मित्र उमर अब्दुल्ला के भााण के बाद सामने बैठे बहुत से लोग चले गए।

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : कुछ आ भी गए हैं।

श्री सैयद शाहनवाज हुसैनः हां, कुछ आ गए हैं। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को बधाई देता हूं कि उन्होंने आगरा पीस टॉक को यहां शुरु किया। मैं जानता हूं कि इस सैनस्टिव मुद्दे पर देश और संसद को एक होना चाहिए लेकिन इसमें राजनीति की जा रही है। सबसे पहले माधवराव जी ने अपनी बात शुरु की। उन्होंने कई सवाल उठाए। उन्होंने लाहौर में सावधानी बरतने की बात की। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि तहलका और पांच प्रदेशों में हुए चुनावों में पार्टी की हार से ध्यान बंटाने के लिए यह वार्ता की गई। मुझे सबसे ज्यादा दुख उस समय हुआ, जब कांग्रेस के किसी नेता के मुख से वाजपेयी जी के बारे में गलत बात सुनने को मिली। माननीय अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जो देश के सबसे बड़े परिपक्व नेता हैं, उनके बारे में ऐसा कांग्रेस पार्टी को बोलने का नैतिक अधिकार नहीं है कि वह इस बारे में एक नौसिखिया साबित हुए। यह वही वाजपेयी जी हैं जिन के कंधों पर जेनेवा सम्मेलन में विपक्ष के नेता के तौर पर आपने जिम्मेदारी सौंपी थी। उस समय वाजपेयी जी ने पूरे देश का मान ऊंचा किया था। आपने उनको नौसिखिया बता कर सिर्फ वाजपेयी जी का नहीं बल्कि देश का अपमान किया। उन्होंने उस समय विपक्ष के नेता के तौर पर नहीं देश के नेता के तौर पर नेतृत्व किया था। जब माधवराव जी अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी के बारे में ऐसा कह रहे हैं कि उनका तरीका नौसिखिए वाला था, मुझे वह सुन कर ताज्जुब हुआ।

सभापति महोदय, हम नई पीढ़ी से आते हैं। हमने आजादी और कश्मीर की बातें किताबों में पढ़ी। कश्मीर समस्या किस के द्वारा दी गई विरासत है और किस की देन है? 1947 से कश्मीर समस्या को कांग्रेस बिगाड़ती रही। इस समस्या को बिगाड़ने के बाद इसे यूएनओ में ले जाने वाला कौन है और इस मुद्दे का अन्तर्राट्रीयकरण किस ने किया? 26 अक्तूबर 1947 को जब कश्मीर का भारत में विलय हुआ तो एक जनवरी 1948 को यूएनओ में कश्मीर समस्या को ले जाना एक बहुत बड़ी बात थी। मैं इस बारे में हरि जयसिंह की किताब " कश्मीर ए टेल ऑफ शेम " से कोट करके एक बात आपके ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूं। उसमें उन्होंने लिखा है :

> "Gen. Thimmaiya was for the advance of the Indian Army till the entire territory was retaken, but Nehru was keen to improve his image as a peacemaker in view of the Asian Relations Conference he had called. This was why Nehru took the matter to the U.N. (without his Cabinet's approval) and perhaps

against the advice of the Mahatma. According to Louis Fischer (life of Mahatma Gandhi page 97), he (Gandhi) regretted the fact that Nehru had submitted the dispute to the U.N. He told Horace Alexander, the British Pacifist, that at the U.N. considerations of international `power politics' rather than merit would determine the attitude of countries towards the Kashmir issue. "

मुझे इस बात का दुख है कि इस मुद्दे को किस तरह यू.एन.ओ. में ले जाया गया। इसके अलावा और भी बहुत से मुद्दे और मसले थे जिसमें हैदराबाद और जूनागढ़ का मसला था, उसे हल किया गया। लेकिन कांग्रेस पार्टी इस मुद्दे का अन्तर्राट्रीयकरण करके हमारी सरकार पर यह आरोप लगा रही है कि हमने इस मुद्दे को ठीक से हैंडल नहीं किया। आप जानते हैं और जैसा श्री उमर अब्दुल्ला ने कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने श्री शेख अब्दुल्ला और डा. फारूख अदुल्ला की सरकारों के साथ जो व्य वहार किया, उसकी वजह से यह मुद्दा काफी खराब हुआ है।

सभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि 2 दिसम्बर, 1989 को केन्द्र में श्री वी.पी. सिंह की सरकार थी और 8 दिसम्बर, 1989 को कुमारी रुबैया का अपहरण किया गया था। उसके बाद ही यह सारा मामला आगे बढ़ा। उसी सरकार का समर्थन श्रीमती कान्ति सिंह कर रही थी जिसकी वह आज बात कह रही थीâ€¦(व्यवधान)

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : आप भी उसी सरकार का समर्थन कर रहे थे।

श्री सैयद शाहनवाज़ हुसैनः हमने बाद में समर्थन वापस ले लिया था।

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह : नहीं, आपने आयोध्या के सवाल पर समर्थन वापस लिया था।

श्री सैयद शाहनवाज हुसैनः नहीं, हमने आपकी हरकत को देखकर समर्थन वापस लिया था। अगर आप उर्दू नहीं समझते हैं तो आपको कोई और शब्द बताते। सभापति महोदय, इन लोगों की हमेशा टोकने की आदत है। इन्होंने ही अपनी बात कहने का ठेका ले लिया है।

सभापति महोदय, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी ने अमन बनाये रखने की एक कोशिश की थी जब वह प्रधानमंत्री बने। इस अमन की कोशिश के तौर पर लाहौर बस यात्रा हुई। उसके बाद हमने कारगिल कांड देखा। उससे कुछ सीखा और हमने इस बात को तय किया कि पाकिस्तान-हिन्दुस्तान सीमा पर हिन्दुस्तानियों और पाकिस्तानियों का खून न बहे, इसलिये यह वार्ता शुरु की गई। आप जानते हैं कि इस वार्ता के बाद कश्मीर में हालात नार्मल हुये। कश्मीर में डा. फारुक अब्दुल्ला के नेतृत्व में 30 साल के बाद पंचायत के चुनाव हुये। कश्मीर के अंदर जिस तरह से हरकत शुरु हुई है और कहा जा रहा है कि वहां पर आतंकवादी हमें जिस तरह की आजादी देना चाहते हैं, वह जेहाद है। वह जेहाद नहीं है, वह पूरी तरह से इनसानियत का खून है। पाकिस्तान वहां जिस तरह की हरकत कर रहा है, वह आलमे इस्लाम को बदनाम कर रहा है। जब से जेहाद शुरु हुआ है, वहां 25 हजार सिविलियन्स मारे गये हैं। 1990 के बाद अनेक मासूम लोग मारे गये हैं।

सभापति महोदय, मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूं कि किसी भी मज़हब की किसी किताब में यह नहीं लिखा कि किसी मासूम के खून से होली खेली जाये। इसी तरह कुरान शरीफ की आयत 32, सुरा-5 में कहा गया है कि जो शख्स किसी बिनाह पर कातिल हो या धरती पर फसाद मचाने वाला हो, कत्ल कर डाले तो उससने तमाम लोगों अर्थात् उसने पूरी मानवता का कत्ल कर डाला। अगर एक व्यक्ति किसी की जान बचाता है, तो वह मानवता अर्थात् इनसानियत को ज़िन्दा करता है। जिस मज़हब ने यह सिखाया है, उसके नाम पर जिसे वे जेहाद कह रहे हैं, उसे हिन्दुस्तान का मुसलमान पूरी तरह से रिजैक्ट करता है। अमन हो या जंग हो, इस देश का मुसलमान सरकार और श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी के साथ खड़ा है। इस तरह से पहली बार हुआ है।

सभापति महोदय, 1965 और 1971 की जब जंग हुई थी, उस समय भारत के हजारों मुसलमानों को थाने में ले जाया गया और कांग्रेस पार्टी की सरकार ने उनसे देशभक्ति का सर्टिफिकेट मांगा। लेकिन जब कारगिल की लड़ाई हुई तो मुसलमानों को थाने में बुलाकर नहीं पूछा गया । इससे मुसलमानों के अंदर एक आत्म-विश्वास जगा है। इस वार्ता में भारत के पूरे 15 करोड़ मुसलमान सरकार और देश के साथ खड़े हैं। इसलिये मैं आपके माध्यम से यही कहना चाहता हूं कि पाकिस्तान जेहाद के नाम पर दंगा-फसाद कर रहा है। यह पूरी तरह से इनसानियत का खून है जिसे कोई मज़हब अलाउ नहीं करता ।

मैं खासकर विपक्ष से अनुरोध करता हूं कि कम से कम इस राट्रीय मुद्दे पर आप इस तरह की राजनीति न करें। यहां से पूरे देश और पूरी दुनिया में यह संदेश जाना चाहिए कि पाकिस्तान के विरुद्ध पूरी संसद और सारी पार्टियां एक हैं, हम मिल-जुलकर अपने देश की एकता और अखंडता की रक्षा करने में सक्षम हैं और कश्मीर का जो हिस्सा पाकिस्तान के पास है, वह भी भारत का अभिन्न अंग है, इस पर पूरी संसद को एक होना चाहिए।

SHRI G.M. BANATWALLA (PONNANI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is most unfortunate and highly disappointing that the Indo-Pak Summit Talks did not lead to any joint declaration or a joint communiqué. But while I say so, I do not go to the extent of characterising the Indo-Pak Summit Talks as an utter failure. I say with all the confidence that the Summit was a partial success.

It was a partial success because of the restoration of the process of dialogue. From the very beginning − I had made it very clear in the meeting of the party leaders called by the hon. Prime Minister − we never looked upon the Indo-Pak Summit Talks as result-oriented. It would be naïve and folly to have so considered the Summit. We always insisted that the correct perception was to expect the Summit to be not result-oriented but process-oriented. In this sense, the Summit was a partial success.

In this partial success characteristic of this Summit, the shining jewel was the offer by the Pakistan President to our Prime Minister to visit Pakistan and the acceptance of that offer by our Prime Minister. I say that this offer to visit Pakistan and the acceptance by our Prime Minister to go over there is the shining jewel that has come from this process-oriented Summit. For this, I must congratulate the Government.

The process has commenced. The entire nation wanted the process to commence and by commencing the process, the Government has responded to the sentiments, feelings and desires of not only the people in India but, I am sure, also of the people in Pakistan and the worldover. For this responsive characteristic of the Government and its governance, I must compliment it. The process has commenced. We have pointed out that there were issues like promotion of Indo-Pak trade relations, cultural exchanges, relaxations in matters of visa, more entry points on our borders, terrorism and several other issues.

Let us know and let us realise that the destiny of the sub-continent lies in cordial and harmonious Indo-Pak relations. One day or the other, the reality will assert and, therefore, this process of dialogue has to continue and continue in the interest of not only India and Pakistan but in the interest of the destiny of the sub-continent and world peace and in the interest of the welfare of our people.

But having said so, I must also point out to some disturbing aspects with respect to the Summit. Of course, I am not one among those breast-beating bands who go on with considerable breast-beating and say that India has afforded recognition to the Pakistan President, Mr. Musharraf, and he got the recognition from the largest democracy of the world. Let us not indulge into these things, I would say, of deceiving ourselves with illusions and delusions. I am also not one among them who want to be tied down by the past so much so that they do not want to move for a bright future.

However, there are certain disturbing aspects and they have to be taken care of. One of them has already been pointed out and that was the degree of unpreparedness with respect to the Summit. I will not dilate much upon that aspect. It has been very clearly brought out. The hon. Prime Minister Shri Vajpayeeji chose to invite Mr. Musharraf for a dialogue knowing, fully well his views. But when he sat down at the negotiating table, he had nothing to offer. This is what I called the level of unpreparedness. You look at the situation. Suddenly Mr. Musharraf was invited, invited at a time when our Prime Minister was unfortunately facing the need for hospitalisation.

What was the position even after he returned from the hospital? The hon. Minister of External Affairs as also the hon. Minister of Home Affairs were trotting all over the world. Here the days of the Summit were coming nearer and they were trotting all over the world. It was hardly in the last few days that we could hear of some talks with respect to the preparedness.

Another disturbing aspect was that, as I had pointed out in the meeting of the Leaders called by the hon. Minister, our Government unnecessarily entangled with certain non-issues and raised these non-issues, the small irritants I must say, into major issues.

An example is the invitation to the Hurriyat Conference for a cup of tea in the High Tea party given by the Pakistan High Commissioner on the arrival of the Pakistani President. We went on breast beating and unnecessarily getting entangled and creating a bad taste everywhere. It ought to have been ignored. Our position with respect to Indo-Pak relations and all issues related to Jammu and Kashmir is solid enough and cannot be upset by a cup of tea which the President may have with anybody in the world.

Another unfortunate issue that we tried to blow up was the telecast of the breakfast meeting by General Musharraf. We must realise that these are the days of information revolution. The world wants information. We cannot go on grudging giving of information to the world. That will not succeed. Instead of beating the breast that he acted contrary to the norms of diplomacy, we ought to have taken up the challenge and we ought to have gone to the nation with our points of view strongly with respect to the points that were raised even on the day of breakfast. Mr. Chairman, our media management was a total disaster. One thing was very clear. Unlike the Indian media, the Pakistani media appeared totally prepared. They knew what to expect. They had a sense of direction.

We, of course, talk about diplomacy and all that. That is correct. Let us observe diplomacy, but I must emphasise on the Government that we have to adjust our diplomatic norms to meet the Pakistan's threats and the Pakistan's style of functioning. We have to adjust. I do not want to say that we throw away the norms of diplomacy in the air; but these are the days when we have to adjust our diplomatic norms also according to the style of functioning of Pakistan.

There have been raised several questions on the confidence-building measures. I compliment the Government for the confidence-building measures unilaterally taken by them. If Pakistan says that the core issue is Kashmir and these confidence-building measures cannot improve Indo-Pak relations and cannot solve the issue, then that is Pakistan's point of view. I may emphasise that even if it is accepted that these confidence-building measures announced by our Prime Minister do not solve the problem of Indo-Pak relations, at least, they provide necessary convenience to the people of both the countries, and are people-oriented and are in the interest of the people and their welfare. Pakistan may not be interested in the interest of the people and their welfare, but we have shown our concern for the problems of the people and for solving those problems of the people.

I will, therefore, compliment the Government also on making it clear that the Government stands by the confidence-building measures that have been announced.

Mr. Chairman, please allow me a few minutes.

I must point out that somewhere we were in great, unholy haste. Take the question of our announcement with respect to DGMO's visit to Islamabad. We ought to have first informed Pakistan that we have decided that the DGMO would visit. We ought to have first informed Pakistan, but in unholy haste, we announced it to the Press and

only the next day the Pak High Commissioner in New Delhi was called and informed. The result was that the Pakistani President asked for the postponement of the visit of the DGMO. These are matters that are to be taken care of.

Now, Sir, today we have a very bland statement from the Prime Minister with respect to the Summit. It has failed to throw light on several issues. Both the Pakistani Foreign Minister, and our Prime Minister, have said that a degree of understanding has been achieved. I quote, "We will build on this to further increase the areas of agreement." That is the opinion of both -- our Prime Minister, and also the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. But one likes to know what are those areas of agreement on which they want to build. The nation has not been taken into confidence, and a very bland statement in that respect has come here.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I know the constraints of time. I must say that in our endeavour to have better and better Indo-Pak relations, let us not forget one important point. I emphasise on the need to work out an acceptable package on the question of autonomy with our alienated people. Our talks with our people in Jammu and Kashmir must continue in order to find out a solution for peace there. We know about the K.C. Pant mission. Now, what has happened to it? That mission must continue with everything.

Finally, before I conclude, I may only point out that let the talks continue. Meet on the sidelines of the U.N. Security Council, meet on the sidelines of the SAARC Summit level meeting. Yes, the Prime Minister should go to Pakistan and have talks. But let us not have confusion. Sometimes, the Prime Minister says that, "I am going to Pakistan". At other times, he says that, "my going will depend upon the situation". Such confused statements are not going to help.

We have a mild statement on Indo-Pak Summit from our Prime Minister here in the Parliament. Every diplomatic angle was looked at. It reflected a very soft attitude, an attitude of promoting the talks. Then, the very next day, we hear the Prime Minister making a statement and gloating over the fact that he has sent Musharraf back empty-handed, and even deprived him of the last minute photo opportunity.

This is in bad taste. Let us build up on the positive aspects. Let us emphasise on the positive aspects and move forward.

Sir, I must conclude by wishing all the best to the Government and by assuring the Government that we are one. We rise as one in all the initiatives that they take in order to see that the process that has been started is continued and taken to its logical end. Proceed forward. *Insha Allah*, success will kiss your feet. The realities will dawn on those who are not prepared to accept the reality.

सभापति महोदय : माननीय सदस्यगण और प्रैस प्रतिनिधियों के लिए कमरा नम्बर 70 में और अन्य लोगों के लिए कमरा नम्बर 73 में भोजन तैयार है।

SHRIMATI KRISHNA BOSE (JADAVPUR): Sir, we have heard a variety of comments this evening from our esteemed colleagues here. I think, two points have come up again and again. I shall try to be brief. I can see the time constraint and I shall just try to focus on those two points, rather those two basic questions, I might say.

What are those two questions? The first question is, was the hon. Prime Minister right in inviting General Musharraf to a high level talk as he did. The second question is, was the Prime Minister right in not signing any agreement or statement at the end of the Agra Summit. I think, the answer to both these questions is an emphatic `yes'. The hon. Prime Minister was perfectly right in inviting General Musharraf and by initiating this peace process. It is because a bilateral process between two nuclear-power neighbours is vital. We cannot say that we shall sit with our backs to each other and that we would never talk to each other. It was very vital that he invited him when he did. Also, India showed to the whole world that we were interested in solving all our outstanding problems at the negotiating table and through discussions. That was also another point.

The next point is that the hon. Prime Minister did consult all of us. He called all the political parties before the Summit talks. I was present in that meeting. The kind of reservations that I now hear from some of my friends, I did not hear on that day. Everybody was very enthusiastic and they welcomed the Prime Minister's initiative. I still remember that Shri Sangma did make some critical comments which he has today reiterated.

The second question is, was the Prime Minister right in not signing any agreement or statement. Now, when we have renewed an inter-Governmental high level talks we must see to it that we cannot focus it on the sole issue of Kashmir. That is just not possible. There are so many other issues that are much more amenable to successful negotiations or, say, mutual co-operation. We cannot focus it on that one issue. Secondly, if we were to agree that Kashmir is the divisive question between our two countries, then the violence that is going on across the Line of Control, which is being sponsored by the Pakistani army, must become the key point in that talk.

Since these two points were not accepted, the Prime Minister was absolutely right in not putting his signature to whatever draft that was doing the rounds.

The Prime Minister made a statement the other day on which we are all debating today. As soon as he finished, I heard the criticism that his statement was very lacklustre. Even today I heard many people say that it was very bald, and that there was nothing much in it. I do not agree to this. The brevity and the dignity of the Prime Minister's statement is in stark contrast to the tenor of General Musharraf's press conference in Islamabad, not to speak of the breakfast meeting with the press that he had in India. Our Prime Minister was addressing the elected representatives of our country and the brevity and the dignity with which he did it is remarkable. Anybody who had watched those two telecasts by General Musharraf would at once have come to the conclusion as to why the summit failed. Our esteemed Foreign Minister also made this point that if you saw those telecasts you would at once understand what went wrong in Agra.

I do have a point of criticism. India could have been much smarter in its handling of the media. We failed miserably there. I appreciate that the Indian side was going by the conventional, decent methods of diplomatic relations. Nobody says something in the middle of a summit. I understand that. But the MEA must remember that this is the electronic age. The media is hungry for accurate information and you cannot starve them. There should have been many more regular and accurate briefings from the MEA which we missed. I should like the MEA to take note of it for future. For that they did secure a point over us in the media management. People turned to Pakistan, and not to the MEA briefings, for whatever they wanted to hear.

Our very respected External Affairs Minister is very fond of saying that Kashmir is at the core of Indian nationhood. We understand what it means. We agree with him perfectly. But, I would like to put in a word of caution. The centrality that we accord to Kashmir by saying this again and again may be misused or exploited by Pakistan who always has this obsession, this single point obsession, with Kashmir. Jammu and Kashmir is no less or no more at the core of Indian nationhood than, say Punjab or Bengal. All our States do contribute to this collective idea of nationhood. So, I would like to just point a word of warning when we use this term again and again.

The Prime Minister has accepted the invitation of the return visit. That was very statesmanlike of him because this process of re-engagement cannot be stopped. It has to go on. At the same time, we have to be very careful about the choice of the time when he will go. We shall have to observe carefully what Pakistan does. There should be something done for the stoppage of the killing of innocent people that is going on. I heard General Musharraf say again and again that these terrorists were not terrorists but they were genuine freedom fighters.

21. 00 hrs.

Sir, many of our colleagues, who are in my age group, have seen in our young age genuine freedom fighters. We do not need to know from General Musharraf who a real freedom fighter is. We know very well. Freedom fighters are always brave people, they are not cowards. They will not go to a remote village in Doda and kill innocent people and innocent women and children. These people are foreign mercenaries, pure and simple, nothing to do with genuine freedom fighters.

I also heard that General Musharraf mentioned about the *Mukti Vahini* of Bangladesh. India, as we all are aware, was very much involved in the Bangladesh war, and I being a Bengali, saw it in front of my eyes. We were very much involved with the *Mukti Vahini* itself.

I should also like to put on record that the *Mukti Vahini* had to take on the full might of the brutal Pakistan Army. They were also not killing innocent people. They had to stand up to the might of the Pakistan Army. So, what is said about the *Mukti Vahini* is also not true.

So, what I mean to say, before the Prime Minister goes to Islamabad, is that we will have to be very careful. We will watch their moves and the timing has to be prepared very carefully. Now, between Agra and Islamabad, we will have some time.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, our heart bleeds for the people of Kashmir. We had all hoped for a break-through, certainly not a solution but a break-through, in this Summit, and the gain should have been Kashmir's. But it looks like that the people of Kashmir will still have to suffer. So, between Agra and Islamabad what can we do? I think, on the side of India, we can carry on what we call the internal track *vis-à-vis* Jammu and Kashmir. We can try to bring all the groups of Jammu and Kashmir, all the political factions of Jammu and Kashmir and try to evolve some formula for workable political accommodation between these groups. We should try; whether we succeed or not, we should try. Also New Delhi can try to give, if possible, some acceptable forms of democratic rights and representation to those segments of Kashmiri people who are alienated and who think that they are not getting justice from our end. These two things we can do between Agra and Islamabad.

Sir, I will not take much time of the House. Everybody is getting hungry and tired. In conclusion, I would like to say that peace, like Taj Mahal, cannot be built in one day, we know that. But Sir, let no one accuse India that we did not

try our level best to build an edifice of peace in this sub-continent.

With these words, I conclude.

श्री संतोा कुमार गंगवार : माननीय सदस्यों के लिए सैन्ट्रल हॉल की लॉबी में भोजन की व्यवस्था की गई है और बाकी स्टॉफ के लिए 73 नंबर में भोजन की व्यवस्था है। यह सूचना माननीय सदस्यों के लिए 70 नंबर पर बताई गई थी, अब सूचनार्थ मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि माननीय सदस्यों के लिए भोजन की व्यवस्था सैन्ट्रल हॉल में है।

श्री प्रकाश यशवंत अम्बेडकर : सभापति जी, मैं मंडे बोलूंगा। ...(*Interruptions*)

श्री अली मोहम्मद नायक : सभापति जी, मुझे बोलने की इजाजत दे दें।

SHRI PRABODH PANDA (MIDNAPORE): Hon. Chairman, Sir, at the very outset, I extend my thanks to you as you have kindly allowed me to participate in the debate on Agra Summit. Most of our esteemed hon. Members have left the House.

First of all, I remember that before the Summit, there was this declaration that unless cross-border terrorism was stopped, no talks could take place. There was also this declaration in some corners that the present Ruler of Pakistan is lacking the legitimacy; unless democracy is restored in Pakistan, no talks could talks place. But suddenly our Government have changed their mind. I do not know what is the cause for changing its thought or idea. In this House our hon. Prime Minister made a statement; I cannot understand what is the reason behind changing his mind. But I am of the opinion that whatever may be the earlier thinking, the initiative taken by the hon. Prime Minister is a welcome one. Our Party welcomed the initiative.

Three rounds of talks took place, but what is the outcome? It is said by some friends, by some esteemed Members of this House that the Summit was a failure, a total failure. I am of the opinion that it is not a total failure but failure in many respects. First of all, it was a failure because there was no concrete proposal and there was no concrete perspective; secondly, we did not come to frame even an agenda for that great Summit. Thirdly, we did not have different options to propose in the Summit or Declaration. Fourthly, even our Government has failed to maintain coordination within the Council of Ministers. We have failed to go with prior and adequate preparations. We have failed in respect of Media also. We should admit it.

It was the expectation that in the Prime Minister's statement, there would be some introspection. Any Summit or any initiative may succeed or may fail. It is not the point. The point is that we have to draw lessons from that and we should assess ourselves.

In the Prime Minister's statement, all these were absent. So, I am of the opinion that his statement is superfluous. It does not go into deep. It is a merely mechanical and defensive statement. But what can we do?

I am not of the opinion that the process of interaction, the process of dialogue be stopped. There is no alternative. The process of dialogue or interaction must continue. This is the expectation of not only the peace-loving people of our country but this is also the public opinion. During the Summit, the expectations were high. Euphoria was allowed to build up. Even I may say that the statement made by the hon. Information and Broadcasting Minister allowed the expectations to go high. What lesson do we learn from this Summit? What is the impact of the Summit?

There are three aspects involved in it. The expectation of the people was high. The peace-loving people of not only the two great countries but also all the countries of SAARC welcomed the Summit. So, this was the public opinion. This was their expectation.

Pakistan has shown its non-cooperative or cold attitude. It made Kashmir to be the sole issue. It enthused cross-border terrorism. Even more, it compared the incident with the liberation struggle of Palestine, which cannot be accepted.

Thirdly, our Government was unprepared.

So, these are the three aspects. We should admit it and take lesson from it. In spite of that, we should not stop the process. Our Prime Minister should go there. I think he is thinking on this line but I would say that he should go there with adequate preparation and should continue the peace process. So far as my Party is concerned, we are prepared to extend all sorts of cooperation for the interest of our motherland and for the peace-loving people of both the countries. There is no other alternative to this. I hope the Government will proceed on these lines. With these few words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI ADHI SANKAR (CUDDALORE): Hon'ble Chairman Sir, I thank the Chair for giving me an opportunity to participate on behalf of Dravida Mannetra Kazhagam in this discussion on the statement made by our Hon'ble Prime

Minister on the talks held during the Agra summit. I would like to put on record the resolution that was unanimously passed on 29th of July, 2001, in the General Council meeting of Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam headed by our beloved leader Dr Kalaignar Karunanidhi. We had expressed our deep appreciation. We appreciate the endeavour of our Prime Minister Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee in initiating a peace process to maintain good neighbourly relations with Pakistan arriving at a lasting solution to many of the issues pending for long between both India and Pakistan. Let me read out from DMK's General Council's Resolution,

"In order to find ways to put an end to cross border terrorism and to evolve a way out to various other vexing issues between India and Pakistan, our Prime Minister Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee held talks with the President of Pakistan General Musharraf at the Agra Summit. Though the summit had an inconclusive ending, we welcome the announcement by the Union Government that the talks would continue to arrive at solutions for various other long pending issues. The General Council of DMK warmly appreciates our Hon. Prime Minister Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee for his peace initiatives and right decisions in this regard."

Even those who have uttered and muttered that Agra summit may not yield any fruitful result, have to accept the fact that the talks in itself sprang a surprise. Both India and Pakistan with their backs to each other came with a open mind to the negotiation table changing their stance a bit. At the outset we had yielded a bit more and came down from our avowed stand to initiate this peace process. Neither Pakistan nor the comity of nations would have failed to notice the shift in India's stand.

* English translation of the speech originally delivered in Tamil.

Intrusions by its intelligence agencies, providing training and arms supply to the extremists are continued by Pakistan. India was steadfast in insisting that there cannot be any dialogue with Pakistan unless its abetment to terrorism is discontinued. Though it surprised many that India had extended on invitation to the President of Pakistan leaving aside its reservations, talks were held with the President of Pakistan with a hope that the scope for a change in Pakistan's attitude could come about only by way of engaging them in a continued dialogue. It is a surprising shift in stand. I would prefer to call it a wonder that had happened.

We cannot expect immediately an assurance from Pakistan that they would not encourage extremists in Kashmir and would not extend any help and support to terrorists in the valley. Expecting such an assurance with an overnight change of heart would be strange. We cannot hope for a sea change all in a day.

"The Agra summit that appeared like a 'pole star' in the horizon had ended like a meteor", is what some seem to think and it only highlights their ignorance. There is nothing wrong in holding a summit aiming at peace but it is not right to look for a sudden change in Pakistan's attitude and approach. The fault lies in the misplaced expectations but not in the holding of talks.

When we look at the prevailing situation in Pakistan, 'Anti-India policy' is seen to be the central axis of things that go on there. That is the talking point to the politicians and civil servants there. That serves as a shield to the Pakistan's military. How can we expect a change of heart overnight. If we expect the change in a day it would be unwise.

General Musharraf had often repeated that 'Kashmir Dispute' was the most important one. But now Pakistan had relented to refer to Kashmir problem as an 'issue' along with other issues to be sorted out between the two countries.

Even before General Musharraf could come to India, Kashmir extremists were abetted and encouraged by Pakistan. For many years now, help and support to the terrorists from across the border are forthcoming. India had been consistently pointing out to the world that the hand of Pakistan is behind the arms supply to terrorists.

As for the issues that were vexing us all for more than 50 years now, we cannot expect a sound solution all within a day. It does not sound sense. No one with a sound mind would think so and find fault with this Government.

We have a bounden duty to make it clear to the people of this country that we have yielded and come forward to hold talks with Pakistan not because we are apprehensive. We do not fear the terrorism and violence let loose by the extremists. We are not incapable of curbing extremism and curtailing terrorism. We have the dynamism, capacity and capability. We do not have any dearth of those qualities. We have not initiated a peace process for want of courage, valour and wisdom on our part. Our countrymen are aware that we are a strong nation and we must reiterate that.

Leaders of both the nations have expressed their determination to improve the lot of the people of their respective countries. They aim at raising the standard of living and quality of life in their respective nation states. Both the leaders want to see their countries prosper. They want all round growth in all spheres of life in both their countries. That is why the leaders of both the nations sought to leave behind the differences and engage themselves in dialogue at the negotiation table. I would like to call the shift in stand a wonder of the world. This can be likened to

eighth wonder.

The Agra summit helped us to identify several other pending issues other than Kashmir and threw open an opportunity. Many issues came to the fore. It gave us an opportunity to highlight the plight of 54 POWs languishing in Pakistani prisons for more than 30 years. Our Prime Minister took up their cause with the President of Pakistan. The issue of providing safe haven in Pakistan to the culprits behind the series of bomb blasts in Mumbai in 1993 was taken up. A request to extradite the terrorists who hijacked our plane to Kandahar in 1999 was pursued. There were exchanges on the plight of fishermen of both the countries straying in to the territorial waters of one another's country. For all these benefits that had come about we must welcome the move to hold a summit at Agra.

We have amply made it clear that any abetment to crimes committed from across the border would throw a spanner to any ongoing negotiations for a peaceful settlement. We have highlighted the point that creating internal disturbances in India will not be in the interest of both the countries.

General Musharraf who captured power through a military coup had declared himself a President. He has crowned himself to be the President of Pakistan. This has not been accepted by the Alliance Parties for the revival of Democracy in Pakistan. Several countries of the world have decried the self-promotion of General Musharraf from being a military ruler to that of the President of Pakistan. When he got an invitation from India he took it as a recognition as a legitimate ruler of Pakistan and proclaimed himself to be the Head of State as the President of Pakistan.

We must look back to analyse and identify the advantages that had accrued due to the holding of Agra summit.

Assuming that there was a Joint Declaration made at the end of the summit, we must ask ourselves whether it would have been accepted as a binding one on both the countries. It is a question whether it would have got constitutional validity, legal sanction and sovereign approval of both the nations.

We have to consider a question whether it would be binding on any future democratically elected Government in Pakistan to recognise an accord signed by a Dictator styled as President who declared himself to be so after capturing power with the might of his military. We also have to take into consideration the observations made Shri Navaz Sharif and Ms Benazir Bhutto, the former Prime Ministers of Pakistan, that General Musharraf had no *loco standi* to sign an accord with any foreign country and that need not be taken sanctiomiously by any future Government in Pakistan.

I see a parallel here from what is happening in Tamil Nadu today. Ignoring democratic norms, even without going to the hurlings after being disqualified from contesting elections, through a short cut method, a convicted person sentenced with three years of imprisonment in a criminal case, has become a Chief Minister. That disqualified person is Ms. Jayalalitha. The Hon. High Court of Madras has raised a valid question whether any administrative decision taken by such a Government headed by such a person would hold good and whether it would be legitimate. Likewise, we see in Pakistan a ruler not elected to power through democratic means. It is a valid question whether such decisions or orders or declarations signed by such leaders would be valid for the future and whether it would be binding at all. It is the need of the hour to raise and answer this relevant question.

Mahatma Gandhi who said that creation of Pakistan would be on his dead body later on resigned to reality and insisted on allocation of more funds to Pakistan. An extremist led by hatred shot him dead. After so many years we saw a Pakistani leader paying floral tributes at the *samadhi* of Mahatma Gandhi. General Musharraf, the ruler who captured power with military might, had recorded in the Visitors' Book at Raj Ghat that Mahatma Gandhi was a *mahan* who dedicated himself to peace and non violence. It is indeed surprising and a wonderful development. I would call this the eighth wonder of the world.

The economic development in the lives of the people of both the countries have to be ensured. Hence certain appreciable measures are in the offing as initiated by India. With the objective of building strong economic and trade ties aiming at improving the lot of the people of both the countries, Union Government's economic ministries like Commerce Ministry are taking effective steps. I would like to congratulate our Hon. Commerce Minister Shri Murasoli Maran, an expert and a visionary in his own stead to strengthen the economic might of India. To build better trade relations between both India and Pakistan he had already extended duty exemption to 50 items on the eve of the summit. It is an appreciable gesture.

It has been provided for to rope in experts in the field of Economics, Commerce and Technology and to negotiate about better economic cooperation between both India and Pakistan. Agra summit has set the ball rolling.

As far as our Prime Minister Shri Vajpayee is concerned, right from the days when he was part of Morarjee Desai's Government, he strongly believed in building friendly relations between both India and Pakistan.

As External Affairs Minister he relaxed visa restrictions to strengthen the foundation for people to people relations

that may improve the ties between both the countries.

It may be true that an accord might not have been reached at the summit where the Executive Heads of both the countries have held talks. But it has to be taken that the talks are just inconclusive. There is still hope as it has been accepted that talks would continue. Now it has become possible to hold political level dialogue on J&K Affairs, Defence Affairs, LOC and Terrorism. It has now opened up an opportunity to hold official level talks on Siachen Glacier, Ullar Dam, Sir Creek Strait. Economic ties, trade relations, curbing the menace of drug trafficking would also be discussed in the official level talks.

While concluding I would like to reiterate that Kashmir is an integral and inseparable part of India. It is the duty of all of us to uphold the same.

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : सभापति महोदय, 14,15 और 16 जुलाई को पाकिस्तान के राट्रपति जनरल मुशर्रफ आगरा आये थे और उनसे चर्चा हुई थी। मुझे नहीं लगता कि श्री वाजपेयी जी ने तीन साल में जितने असफल काम किये, यह सबसे ज्यादा सफल काम किया होगा। यह सही है कि चर्चा की गई लेकिन पाकिस्तान के जनरल मुशर्रफ शाइन होकर चले गये जो यहां कश्मीर मामले के अलावा किसी और मुद्दे पर वार्ता करने के लिये तैयार ही नहीं थे। मेरा सरकार से पूछना है कि जब वे दूसरे किसी विाय पर बातचीत करने के लिये तैयार ही नही थे तो उन्हें यहां बुलाया क्यों गया?

2129 hrs. (अध्यक्ष महोदय पीठासीन हुए)

उनके यहां आने पर सिक्यूरिटी पर डेढ़ करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया गया। हां, इससे सब लोगों का टाइम जरूर पास हो गया। हालांकि बातचीत से कुछ नहीं निकला लेकिन फिर भी बुलाने का अच्छा काम किया गया। जिस तरह हमारे प्रधानमंत्री श्री वाजपेयी जी एक सीधे-सादे आदमी हैं, जो चाहते थे कि दूसरे वियों पर चर्चा होती मगर दूसरी ओर जनरल मुशर्रफ एक मिलिट्रीमैन हैं, बहुत उस्ताद आदमी हैं जो यहां यह सोचकर आये कि कश्मीर मामले के अलावा किसी और मुद्दे पर चर्चा नहीं करनी।

श्री अली मोहम्मद नायक : एक तानाशाह को भी बुलाया जाता है?
श्री रामदास आठवले : जरूर बुलाना चाहिये, भारत को चलाना चाहिये। यहां बुलाने से काम नहीं चलने वाला है लेकिन पाकिस्तान के साथ दोस्ती करने के बारे में कोई विरोध नहीं है।

अगर पाकिस्तान हमारे साथ दोस्ती नहीं करना चाहता तो हम किसलिए दोस्ती करें। पाकिस्तान को भी दोस्ती के बारे में सोचने की आवश्यकता है। केवल हम पाकिस्तान की तरफ दोस्ती का हाथ आगे करें और मुशर्रफ दो कदम पीछे जायें। यदि इसी तरह से काम चलता रहेगा तो दोस्ती होने वाली नहीं है। मुशर्रफ जी सही कह रहे थे कि सवाल केवल जम्मू-कश्मीर का है, जम्मू-कश्मीर के इश्यु पर ही चर्चा होनी चाहिए। इसलिए हमारे देश में जम्मू-कश्मीर पर एजेन्डा तैयार रखने की आ वश्यकता है और वह आपके पास है। जम्मू-कश्मीर का एक-तिहाई भाग पाकिस्तान के पास है। पाकिस्तान के पास कश्मीर का जो हिस्सा है, वह हमें सौंप दे, जम्मू-कश्मीर से पाकिस्तान का क्या संबंध है।

सभापति महोदय, 26 अक्टूबर, 1953 को वहां के सब लोगों ने तय किया था कि हमें भारत में रहना है और आर्टीकल 370 के माध्यम से उन्हें ऑटोनोमी दे दी गई। उसी तरह से जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोग यह चाहते हैं कि हम भारत में रहेंगे और भारत हमारा है। उसके बावजूद भी पाकिस्तान वाले एक्सट्रीमिस्ट लोगों को वहां ले जाते हैं, उन्हें ट्रेनिंग देते हैं, फिर उन्हें वापिस भेजते हैं, वे हमारे लोगों पर हमला करते हैं, हम चुपचाप बैठे रहते हैं और वे हमारे लोगों को मार रहे हैं। मेरा वाजपेयी जी और श्री जसवन्त सिंह जी से यही निवेदन है कि अगर पाकिस्तान सीधे रास्ते से नहीं सुनता है तो पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध करने की आवश्यकता है। आप पाकिस्तान के साथ युद्ध करो और पाकिस्तान का एक-तिहाई हिस्सा अपने कब्जे में ले लो तभी वह कश्मीर का एक-तिहाई हिस्सा छोड़ेगा, नहीं तो वह उस हिस्से को छोड़ने वाला नहीं है और हम भी पाकिस्तान को छोड़ने वाले नहीं हैं। यह काम हमें करने की आवश्यकता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी वाजपेयी साहब पाकिस्तान जा रहे हैं, उनके वहां जाने में हमारा कोई विरोध नहीं है, लेकिन स्वयं जाने से पहले वह श्री जसवंत सिंह जी को वहां भेजें। वह वहां बातचीत का एजेन्डा लेकर जाएं और मुशर्रफ साहब से बात करें। यदि उस एजेन्डा पर मुशर्रफ साहब बात करने के लिए तैयार हों तो वाजपेयी साहब को वहां भेजना चाहिए, नहीं तो बेकार में पैसा खर्च करने में कोई फायदा नहीं है। बेकार में पैसा खर्च करने की आवश्यकता भी नही है। हमारे देश की इकोनोमी खराब होती जा रही है और हमारी बदनामी भी हो रही है। आपके पास पैसा भी नहीं है। आप अच्छा-अच्छा करना चाहते हैं, मगर आपके हाथ में पैसा नहीं है, इसलिए अच्छा होने वाला नहीं है। जब तक आपके हाथ में सत्ता है, तब तक और कहीं से हमारे पास पैसा आने वाला नहीं है। मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि अगर अटल जी पाकिस्तान जाना चाहते हैं, तो उससे पहले ऐसा करना जरूरी है। हम अटल जी का बहुत आदर करते हैं, हमें एक अच्छा प्रधान मंत्री मिला है, लेकिन बाकी के लोग अच्छे नहीं है, इसलिए सब गड़बड़ होती जा रही हैं।

इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है प्रमोद महाजन जी आप यहां संसदीय कार्य मंत्री हैं और इस सभा के एक प्रमुख व्यक्ति भी है, मेरा कहना है कि मुशर्रफ जी से जम्मू-कश्मीर के बारे में बात होनी चाहिए। मेरा मत यह है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर का एक इंच भी भाग पाकिस्तान को नहीं मिलना चाहिए। अगर उस बारे में पाकिस्तान के साथ हमेशा के लिए दोस्ती करना चाहते हैं तो मुशर्रफ जी से बात करें। उन्हें यहां बुलाने की आवश्यकता इसलिए नहीं थी क्योंकि वह एक मिलिट्रीमैन है। उनका दिमाम थोड़ा ठीक नहीं रहता है। वह कोई इलैक्टिड राट्रपति नहीं है और जब तक पाकिस्तान में चुनाव नहीं होता है। तब तक उनके साथ बात करने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है। लेकिन आप लोग एक काम अच्छा करते रहे हैं, आप पाकिस्तान जाने से पहले सभी पार्टियों के साथ बात करें, लेकिन जब आप अपोजीशन पार्टीज को बुलाते हैं तो हमें नहीं बुलाते हैं, चूंकि हमारी पार्टी एक मैम्बर की पार्टी है। मैंने उस दिन भी बोला था, मुझे एक मैम्बर बोल रहे थे कि आपकी पार्टी एक मैम्बर की पार्टी है। मैने

उनसे कहा कि 1982 में तुम्हारी दो मैम्बर की पार्टी थी और 18-19 साल में तुम्हारे 182 मैम्बर्स बन गये हैं। इसी तरह से हमारी रिपब्लिकन पार्टी के भी दस साल में सौ मैम्बर बन सकते हैं, हम भी सरकार बना सकते हैं। अगर हम सरकार बनायेंगे तो अपने प्रधान मंत्री को पाकिस्तान भेजेंगे, तब तक आपको यह चान्स मिला हुआ है। इस बारे में भी आप लोगों को विचार करने की आवश्यकता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोगों से हमारा निवेदन है कि आप तो हमारे साथी हैं, आपको हम गले से लगाने वाले लोग हैं, आपको भारत के साथ ही रहना है। यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात है कि जम्मू-कश्मीर के लोग भारत के साथ रहना चाहते हैं। जम्मू-कश्मीर के सब लोग कहते हैं कि भारत हमारा देश है। अगर उसके बावजूद भी पाकिस्तान उग्रवादियों को भारत में भेजता है तो भारत को भी उसी तरह का काम करना चाहिए।

अपने लोगों को भी उधर भेजने की आवश्यकता है और वे जिस तरह से हमारे लोगों को इधर मार रहे हैं उसी तरह से उधर भी लोगों को मारना चाहिए। इस बारे में थोड़ा विचार करने की आवश्यकता है। अगर दोनों देशों में दोस्ती होती है तो होनी चाहिए मगर जम्मू-कश्मीर के विाय पर पाकिस्तान अगर यह चाहता है कि वह उनके कब्जे में जाए तो उस पर हमारी दोस्ती नहीं होगी, इस बारे में आप सोचें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का मौका दिया उसके लिए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूं। हमें बोलने का मौका मिला है मगर पाकिस्तान जाने का मौका इनको मिलने वाला है, वहां जाकर अच्छी बातचीत आप करें। मुशर्रफ साहब हमारे साथ बातचीत करने के लिए आए और एक विाय जम्मू कश्मीर पर ही बोलते रहे, आप भी ऐसा ही करें कि पाकिस्तान जाएं और उनकी बात पर चर्चा न करते हुए अपनी चर्चा करें और वापस आ जाएं और फिर हमें बताएं कि हमने ऐसा-ऐसा किया है। यह काम भी आपको करना चाहिए। इस इश्यू पर आगरा समिट फेल हुई है। आपने अच्छे इरादे से समिट बुलाई थी मगर उन्होंने आपकी बात नहीं मानी। आप दूसरी शिखर वार्ता बुलाने का प्रयास न करें क्योंकि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है। अभी तो एमपी की सुरक्षा पर भी पैसा खर्च नहीं हो पा रहा है। हमारी सदस्या फूलन देवी की हत्या हुई और दूसरे एमपीज का क्या होगा इसका कुछ पता नहीं है। हम एमपीज को भी सुरक्षा नहीं दे पा रहे हैं। अगर फूलन देवी के साथ दो कमांडो होते तो पिस्तौल वाले गोली नहीं चला सकते थे। इसलिए सभी एमपीज को दो-दो कमांडो दे दो और अगर आपके पास ज्यादा पुलिस वाले नहीं हैं तो फौरन नई भर्ती करो और सब लोगों की सुरक्षा पर विचार करो।

अंत में मैं सरकार से इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि जो इस्लामाबाद में वार्ता होगी वह सफल होनी चाहिए और उसके लिए एजेन्डा पर विचार करने की आ वश्यकता है। जय हिन्द, जय भारत।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव (झंझारपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कोई लंबा व्याख्यान नहीं दूंगा। आपके माध्यम से मुझे कहना है कि जो बहस हो रही है यह चूंकि राट्रीय और अंतर्राट्रीय मुद्दा है और इस महत्वपूर्ण विाय पर आगरा की वार्ता को बिल्कुल विफलता के दृटिकोण से देखना न्यायोचित नहीं होगा। मैं इसलिए इस बात का जिक्र करना चाहता हूं कि इसके दो पहलू हैं। विफलता और सफलता दोनों पहलुओं पर इसको देखना चाहिए। दोनों दृटिकोणों से देखने की ज़रूरत है। विफलता किस कारण से हुई, इसमें कई सवाल उठे। मीडिया मैनेजमेंट नहीं हुआ तो पहले से तैयारी भी पूरी नहीं थी। पहली बार मैं समझता हूं कि 9 जुलाई को बैठक बुलाई गई थी सभी पक्ष के लोगों की और इससे पहले एनडीए से बात की गई थी और जो कुछ करना था वह युद्ध विराम के समय करने की जरूरत थी। जब आमंत्रण दे दिया गया तो इसके बाद सिर्फ शिखर वार्ता का एजेन्डा तय करना था, स्ट्रक्चर्ड एजेन्डा को, सुविचारित एजेन्डा तय करने की बात थी।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इसमें कुछ किया जा सकता था, इस एरिया में कुछ संभावनाएं थीं, लेकिन जहां तक विफलता का सवाल है उसका कारण यह है कि मुशर्रफ साहब, कश्मीर को केन्द्र बिन्दु मानकर वार्ता करना चाहते थे। मुशर्रफ साहब ने केवल हुर्रियत से बात करना पसन्द किया। यहां की जो चुनी हुई सरकार है, जम्मू-कश्मीर की जो चुनी हुई सरकार है, जो वहां की नैशनल कान्फ्रेंस पार्टी है, जो वहां के चीफ मिनिस्टर श्री फारुख अब्दुल्ला हैं, तथा जो वहां के चुने हुए सांसद हैं, उनसे बात करना उन्होंने पसन्द नहीं किया। आखिर लोक तंत्र में चुने हुए लोगों को मान्यता न देकर, उनसे बात न कर, उन्होंने हुर्रियत से वार्ता करना जरूरी समझा, जबकि भारत का हुर्रियत के साथ वार्ता करने में ऐतराज था, क्यों ऐसा हुआ ? यही विफलता का कारण है। असफलता का एक कारण यह भी है कि मुशर्रफ साहब ने हठधर्मिता का आचरण अपनाने का काम किया। जिस बात को उन्हें खुलकर कहना चाहिए था, उसको भी उन्होंने नहीं कहा। यही असफलता का कारण है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, असफलता का दूसरा कारण यह भी है कि उन्होंने जितने भी डिप्लोमैटिक नार्म हैं, उनको धता बताने का काम किया। पांच-पांच मिनट के बाद पाकिस्तान के मीडिया को प्रगति का समाचार रिलीज किया जाता था। यह ठीक है कि हम मीडिया मैनेजमेंट उतना अच्छा नहीं कर सके जितना कि हमें करना चाहिए था और हम अपनी बात मीडिया को नहीं बता पाए, लेकिन हमारा देश जो डिप्लोमैटिक नार्म हैं उनका पालन कर रहा था। चाहे विदेश मंत्री हों या प्रधान मंत्री जी हों, जो राजनयिक सिद्धान्त हैं, उनका अक्षरशः पालन कर रहे थे। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम सिविलाइज्ड हैं, तो कोई देश हमारे सिविलाइजेशन के तरीके के व्य वहार को हमारी कमजोरी समझे। Civilization is not our weakness. यह हमारी सभ्यता का प्रतीक है। हम सभ्य तरीके से वार्ता चलाना चाहते हैं, पूरे डिप्लोमैटिक नार्म का अनुपालन करना चाहते हैं, तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि हम कमजोर हैं, या सभ्यता को कोई देश हमारी कमजोरी समझे। यदि कोई देश ऐसा समझता है, तो यह उसकी भूल है। मैंने इसीलिए इस बात का जिक्र किया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, शिमला समझौते और लाहौर समझौते को वे आधार नहीं मानते, इसलिए विफलता हुई। इसी प्रकार विफलता के कई अनेक कारण हैं। सीमा पार से हमारे देश में आतंकवाद चलाना, क्रास बार्डर टैररिज्म चलाना, जिसको वे मुद्दा नहीं मानते, बल्कि वे कहते हैं कि यह तो वहां के लोगों की आजादी की लड़ाई है। इसलिए इसमें विफलता मिली।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब लाहौर डिक्लेरेशन हुआ, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उस समय एक सौहार्दपूर्ण वातावरण बनाया था और हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान के बीच वार्ता करने के माहौल का निर्माण किया था, लेकिन वह वातावरण कारगिल युद्ध होने के बाद डायल्यूट हो गया, संपूर्ण रूप से ध्वस्त हो गया। जो वातावरण पड़ौसी देश के नाते वार्ता करने का निर्मित हुआ, वह समाप्त हो गया। हिंसा का एक ही विकल्प है कि शांतिपूर्ण ढंग से वार्ता की जाए। उनको देखते हुए भारत के पास एक ही विकल्प है कि वार्ता की जाए और समस्या का समाधान किया जाए। उसको रेस्टोर करने का काम हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने किया।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने पहले ही कहा, आगरा वार्ता को सफलता और विफलता दोनों दृटिकोणों से देखना चाहिए। सफलता इस मायने में है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी और माननीय विदेश मंत्री जी ने कारगिल के बाद वार्ता का जो वातावरण ध्वस्त हो गया था, उसको रेस्टोर किया। हमारे देश ने कहा है कि हमारे दरवाजे वार्ता के लिए खुले हुए हैं, वार्ता जारी है और वार्ता जारी रहेगी। इस बिन्दु से आगरा वार्ता को सफल माना जाना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह ठीक है कि अमरनाथ यात्रियों पर आतंकवादियों ने बम फेंक कर उनकी जान ली, यह कायराना प्रयास है, लेकिन इस मामले पर जब मोहन रावले जी बोल रहे थे, तो मैं देख रहा था, वे बहुत भावुक होकर बोल रहे थे और उन्होंने अपने भााण में कहा कि यह हिन्दुओं पर अटैक हो रहा है। मैं मोहन रावले जी से बड़े विनम्र शब्दों में निवेदन करूंगा कि वे इस मामले को हिन्दू और मुसलमान के नजरिये से न देखें। यह देशी और परदेशी का मामला है। परदेशी आतंकवादियों ने हिन्दुस्तान के अमरनाथ श्रद्धालुओं पर बम फेंक कर कायरता का परिचय दिया है। इसलिए इस मामले को हिन्दू-मुसलमान के नजरिये से नहीं देखना चाहिए। मेरा यही निवेदन है। यह मामला बहुत सेंसिटिव मामला है। यह बहुत संवेदनशील विाय है, यह हिन्दू और मुसलमान का मामला नहीं है बल्कि देशी और परदेशी आतंकवाद का मामला है जिसके अंदर परदेशी आतंकवादियों ने देश के धार्मिक यात्रियों पर बम फेंक कर आक्रमण किया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि इस बारे में यह भी देखें कि और किन-किन लोगों की हत्याएं की गई हैं। इसी सदन के सदस्य अब्दुल रशीद शाहीन

साहब जो हमारे सदन के सदस्य हैं और नैशनल कान्फ्रेंस के सदस्य हैं उनके भाई की 11 जुलाई को गोली मारकर हत्या कर दी गई। यह हादसा तब हुआ जब मुशर्रफ साहब यहां 14-15 जुलाई को आने वाले थे। कसूर सिर्फ इतना था कि वे देशभक्त थे और कश्मीर को इस देश का अभिन्न अंग मानते थे। हमारे इसी सदन में 22 फरवरी, 1994 को यह प्रस्ताव पास हुआ कि कश्मीर भारत का अभिन्न अंग है और उसको हमसे कोई नहीं छीन सकता। यही बात उन्होंने कही और परदेशी आतंकवादियों ने उनकी जान ले ली क्योंकि उनकी इस देश के प्रति इंटीग्रटी थी, उन्होंने इस देश के प्रति स्वाभिमान व्यक्त किया, उनका आचरण एक देशभक्त की तरह था, लेकिन उन्हें अपनी जान गंवानी पड़ी। श्री शाहीन साहब, बहुत बहादुर, बहुत समझबूझ वाले सदस्य हैं, लेकिन उनकी देशभक्ति के कारण उनके भाई की हत्या कर दी गई।

उनके भाई को जाना पड़ा। हिन्दू और मुसलमान दोनों राट्रवाद की कीमत चुका रहे हैं। जब पाकिस्तान से हमारी लड़ाई हुई थी तो टैंक तोड़ने वाला अब्दुल हमीद कौन था। इस बात की कभी बू नहीं आने देनी चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान की सरहद में जो भी लोग हैं वे राट्रीय हैं। हमें कभी ऐसी रेखा नहीं खींचनी चाहिए, इससे गलत मैसेज जाता है क्योंकि यह राट्रीय मामला है।â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री अली मोहम्मद नायक : अमरनाथ बम कांड में छः यात्री मरे और उनके साथ चार मुसलमान पोर्टर्स और एक पुलिस वाला भी मरा। अब हिन्दू-मुसलमान का सवाल कहां है? पांच मुसलमान मरे, छः हिन्दू मरे, वे मुसलमान, जो यात्रा को इसलिए जारी रखना चाहते हैं क्योंकि उनकी रोजी-रोटी का मसला उसके साथ बावस्ता है।

श्री देवेन्द्र प्रसाद यादव : मैंने आपकी ही बात कही थी। उनके भाई नसीर अहमद की हत्या हुई। उससे पहले यात्रा में हत्याएं हुईं। इसलिए मैंने कहा कि इसे उस नजरिए से देखने की जरूरत नहीं है। मेरी बात में आपकी बात की ही सहमति थी।

मैं आगरा शिखर वार्ता को लेकर सरकार को घेरने और बचाने की प्रवृत्ति के पक्ष में नहीं हूं क्योंकि यह अंतर्राट्रीय स्तर का मामला है। कश्मीर की समस्या बहुत संगीन और संवेदनशील है। मुलायम सिंह जी अभी नहीं हैं, उन्होंने इसे शुरू किया था। मैं श्री सिंधिया जी, श्री चंद्र शेखर जी और डा. विजय कुमार मल्होत्राजी को सुन रहा था। हमें कुछ अतीत की ओर भी झांकना चाहिए। आजादी के संग्राम के समय महात्मा गांधी ने क्विट इंडिया, (अंग्रेजों भारत छोड़ो) का नारा दिया था। उस समय अंग्रेजों के पास जो थिंक टैंक था, उसमें उनका नारा था - पहले स्प्लिट इंडिया तब क्विट इंडिया। इसलिए इस बंटवारे के पीछे हमें पाकिस्तान की बुनियाद को भली-भांति समझना चाहिए। पाकिस्तान स्प्लिट के सिद्धान्त पर बना है। इसीलिए महात्मा गांधी ने जब क्विट इंडिया कहा जो अंग्रजों के लिए थिंक टैंक था, उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को स्प्लिट इंडिया तब क्विट इंडिया कहा और यही हुआ। इसलिए इन तथ्यों में जाने के बाद कोई संदेह नहीं है।

मुलायम सिंह जी समाजवादी पार्टी के नेता हैं। उन्होंने हिन्द-पाक महासंघ की बात बहुत जोर से कही। आज हिन्द-पाक महासंघ की जरूरत है। हम भी कुछ दिन पहले इस विचार से पूर्णतया सहमत थे लेकिन आज की तारीख में, क्योंकि डा. राम मनोहर लोहिया की एक कल्पना थी, वे बहुत बड़े दार्शनिक थे, इस देश की आजादी में 1942 की मूवमैंट में भी उनका बहुत योगदान रहा। उस समय की परिस्थिति को देखते हुए भाई-भाई का बंटवारा हुआ था, उस समय उन्होंने पाक और हिन्द महासंघ की बात कही थी। आज परिस्थितियां बिल्कुल बदल चुकी हैं। आज के परिवेश में उसे इटोपिया कहा जा सकता है, वह व्यवहारिक नहीं है, जो स्थिति आज है। श्री संगमा जी ने उसका जिक्र किया। मैं अपनी बात खत्म करता हूं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, 22 फरवरी, 1994 को इस सर्वोच्च सदन में जो प्रस्ताव रखा गया था, मैं उसकी अंतिम बात यहां उद्धृत करूंगा। जम्मू कश्मीर भारत का अभिन्न अंग रहेगा...(व्यवधान).. इसके अलावा और कई सारी बातें हैं लेकिन यह बात भी आई थी, सदन के जरिए यह प्रस्ताव था कि -"पाकिस्तान को भारत के जम्मू कश्मीर राज्य के उस हिस्से को खाली कर ही देना चाहिए जिस पर उसने बलपूर्वक कब्जा किया है और यह तय करता है कि भारत के आन्तरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करने के किसी भी प्रयास का माकूल जवाब दिया जाएगा। जब यह सर्वोच्च सदन सर्वसम्मति से इस आशय का प्रस्ताव पारित कर चुका है तो क्या इससे भिन्न राय रखना, भिन्न वक्तव्य देना सदन की अवमानना नहीं है?

अध्यक्ष महोदय,विदेश मंत्री यहां मौजूद हैं और मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से चाहूंगा कि वे इस सदन को यह जरूर बताएं कि 22 फरवरी, 1994 को सदन में जो प्रस्ताव आया था, हमने उसकी भावनाओं को कहां तक हासिल किया है तथा आगे हमारी क्या रणनीति है। प्रधान मंत्री जी जब इस्लामाबाद जाएंगे तो उससे पहले इस पर गंभीरता से विचार कर लें।

मैं एक अंतिम बात कहना चाहता हूं।

हमारी वार्ता की सफलता और विफलता के पीछे भी कुछ बात है, इसके लिए अन्तर्राट्रीय कूटनीति का सूक्ष्म अध्ययन हमको करना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि अमेरिका का नजरिया चीन के प्रति और चीन का दृटिकोण अमेरिका के प्रति, दुनिया की ये जो महाशक्तियां हैं, इनकी मंशा को बिना समझे सचमुच वार्ता का कोई हल निकलने वाला है या नहीं, यह प्रश्नचिन्ह है, यह अंडर ब्रेकिट है। मैं इसलिए कहना चाहता हूं कि यह प्रश्न खड़ा है, इस पर बहुत गम्भीरता से विचार करने की जरूरत है। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव है कि देश के कूटनीतिज्ञों और विशेाज्ञों को इसपर सोचना चाहिए, मणिशंकर अय्यर जी ठीक कह रहे थे कि जब आपने पाकिस्तान का आमंत्रण स्वीकार कर लिया है तो कोई हर्जा नहीं है। हमने आमंत्रण दिया, उन्होंने स्वीकार किया तो हमें भी आमंत्रण स्वीकार करना चाहिए और वार्ता जरूर करनी चाहिए। वार्ता से हमें कभी भागना नहीं चाहिए। लेकिन हम यह जरूर कहेंगे कि कोई स्ट्रक्चर्ड एजेण्डे, सुविचारित एजेण्डे के साथ ही वार्ता हो। भविय में वार्ता करने से पूर्व सावधानी बरतने की जरूरत है, अधिक सावधानी इसलिए बरतने की जरूरत है कि आगरा की तरह इस बार भी बिना सुविचारित एजेण्डे के हमको वार्ता करने से कोई फलाफल निकलने वाला नहीं है, इसीलिए मैं सरकार से यही अनुरोध करूंगा कि निश्चित रूप से एक कमेटी भी बनानी पड़े, दोनों सदनों से भी राय या सभी पक्षों से भी राय लेनी हो, कूटनीतिज्ञों की या दलों के लोगों की राय लेनी हो तो अभी पूरा समय है। हमें पूरी तैयारी के साथ, पूरे एजेण्डे के साथ, स्ट्रक्चर्ड एजेण्डे के साथ, सुविचारित एजेण्डे के साथ ही कोई वार्ता करनी चाहिए। हमें वार्ता से घबराने की जरूरत नहीं है। आपने वार्ता का दरवाजा खोलकर रखा, यह निश्चित रूप से सफलता है, एची वमेंट है। हमारे देश के सामने और कोई रास्ता, कोई विकल्प भी नहीं है। वार्ता में हमें कितनी सफलता मिलती है, यह सवाल नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि हमने वार्ता को रैस्टोर कर दिया है, जो वार्ता कारगिल के बाद बिल्कुल डाइल्यूट हो चुकी थी, उसमें यह निश्चित रूप से एक सफलता है।

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11 a.m.

21.52 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on

Thursday, August 2, 2001/Sravana 11, 1923 (Saka).